DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 052 FL 017 943

AUTHOR	Lord, Natalia; Shektman, Boris
TITLE	Mark Smith's Diary.
INSTITUTION	Foreign Service (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C. Foreign Service Inst.
PUB DATE	86
NOTE	84p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Russian Section, Foreign Service Institute, 1400 Key Blvd., Arlington, VA 22209.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Classroom Use - Materials (For Learner) (051) -- Multilingual/Bilingual Materials (171)
LANGUAGE	Russian; English
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cultural Differences; Culture Conflict; *Diaries; Foreign Countries; *Intercultural Communication; Public Agencies; *Russian; Second Language Learning; *Sociocultural Patterns
IDENTIFIERS	*USSR

ABSTRACT

Instructional materials for use in the U.S. Foreign Service Institute's Russian language training program are based on the diary of a fictional foreign service officer stationed in Moscow. The materials, written in both English and Russian, are organized as chapters in the diary. A quiz accompanies each chapter and focuses on the influence of culture and genre on langauge use. The chapters include information from both before and after the beginning of perestroika. Chapter topics focus on the following areas: (1) meetings and greetings; (2) shopping and money; (3) family; (4) the theater; (5) Moscow; (6) restaurants; (7) travel; (8) education; (9) medical care; (10) the Soviet press; (11) attitudes toward the Soviet government; (12) foreign relations; and (13) perestroika. The diary relates conversations between one American and his Soviet friend who emigrates. Early diary entries are entirely in English, but their Russian content increases until they are entirely in Russian. English translations of all Russian passages are included. (DJD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303052

DRAFT COPY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
LORD, U.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

MARK SMITH'S DIARY

Natalia Lord
Boris Shekhtman

FL017943

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOREWORD

Mark Smith's Diary has been developed to support the Russian language program at the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), U.S. Department of State. Controversial topics in the areas of politics, international relations, social mores, etc., are included because FSI students may later find themselves in situations where clear understanding of conversations or written material on these topics will be essential to their mission. The presence of controversial statements--whether real or apparent--in this Diary should not be construed as necessarily representing the opinions of the writers, FSI, or the Department of State.

Mark Smith's Diary was conceived and written by FSI Russian language and culture instructors Natalia Lord (English language entries) and Boris Shekhtman (Russian language entries), under the supervision of Betty Leaver. Russian proofreading was accomplished by Bella Dantsker. English language translations and summaries were done by Natalia Lord and Larry Napper. Word-processing was accomplished by Jeanne Martin, Janet Moore, Shane Sadler, and Julie Ward. Technical assistance was provided by Kyrill Borissow, Jr. The manuscript was edited by Hedy A. St. Denis, who also made arrangements for final publication. Anne Meagher, from the FSI Audio-Visual Facility, designed the cover, adapting a drawing done by Yuriy Mylko. Acknowledgement is also given to the following individuals for their assistance: Sharon Flank, Bill Schinn, Earl Stevick, and Irene Thompson.

Ambassador Harry E.T. Thayer
Dean, School of Language Studies
Foreign Service Institute
U.S. Department of State

Table of Contents

1983-1985

1. Preface 4
2. Reasons for this Diary 6
3. Meetings and Greetings 7
4. Shopping and Money 9
5. Families 12
6. Theater 16
7. On the Streets of Moscow 18
8. Restaurant 23
9. Travel 28
10. Education 32
11. Medicine 35
12. Terminology 39
13. Reading Soviet Newpapers 41
14. Attitudes toward the Government 43
15. Foreign Relations 45
16. Propaganda 48
17. Newspapers, Books, Poetry 51
18. Quiz 55

1985-1987

19. Mark's Question 60
20. Nikolai's Answer 62

1987-1988

21. Perestroika 73

22. Afterword 81

1.
Вступление
(Preface)

Cross-cultural communication problems often arise from the fact that individual words or phrases are interpreted in light of a particular culture. In addition to these purely linguistic communication barriers, there are many differences in accepted behavioral norms in various cultures. Thus, an American whose foreign language is very good may still have communication problems due to an incorrect interpretation of his/her interlocutor's behavior.

When East Germans emigrate to West Germany, they find themselves in a place where the language may be the same but many other things are different. The difference in surroundings, in radio and TV programs, in popular songs, in newspaper articles, and in slang expressions construct communication barriers between native West Germans and those who emigrate from the East that are obviously nonlinguistic in origin. It is the everyday genre, or cultural component, that differs sharply between the two groups.

If people with a shared native language (this holds true also for British vs. American English) can "speak different languages" while in actuality using the same language, and if our goal in pursuing the study of a new language is to communicate with the speakers of that language, then we must devote careful consideration to genre differences between our own society and that of the speakers of the language to be studied.

Genre is something that fills the very air that people breathe in a given society and culture and is often an amorphous entity that can defy accurate and meaningful description. It is something we acquire with our native tongue and not a body of information that is easily learned. Psycholinguistic factors come into play, as do shared values and behavioral norms. These are acquired from within a society as if by osmosis. When trying to enable someone to "learn" these cultural differences while standing outside the culture, we are forced to describe those things which either defy description or are reduced to clichés and stereotypes by them.

This is partly explained by the very nature of such an undertaking. Statements about genre, mentality, and culture of a nation inevitably fall short of sharing and transmitting a "sense" of what lies behind the statement. If we were to allow this fact to scare us off from attempting to transmit any information about the differences between Soviet and American mentalities and cultures, however, we would be guilty of a grave injustice towards our students. Those who study Russian in order to live in the Soviet Union and communicate with native speakers of Russian need to know when differences in the cultures present barriers to comunication even in the face of linguistic proficiency.

Since our aim is to point out differences (things that are the same pose no threat to communication or understanding), we will point out the most obvious ones. Once the student is made aware of the most glaring differences, we hope s/he will learn to look for more subtle ones.

The vehicle we chose for illustrating some of the differences between Russian/Soviet culture is that of the diary of a purely fictional Mark Smith, who happens to be the main personage in language textbooks of FSI's Russian language course. From the language text we know Mark Smith to be a Foreign Service officer stationed in Moscow.

To serve our purpose better, however, we are now expanding his biography and revealing the fact that Mark Smith had earlier been an exchange student in Leningrad on an IREX grant. While there, he met and became friends with Nikolai Sidoroff, who was very interested in America and American culture. Mark remained friends with Nikolai while serving at the American Embassy in the early 1980's and when he returned on a temporary assignment in 1987. The diary thus covers a period stemming from the 1970's to the late 1980's, covering both the pre-perestroika and early-perestroika period.

We have chosen someone who is critical of the society that he is a product of in order to allow a rejoinder to attitudes that one encounters when dealing with Soviet officialdom. If we were to present only two attitudes, namely the American one "looking into the society from the outside" and the "official" Soviet one from the inside, the picture would not be complete for obvious reasons. We thus introduce someone who can look at Soviet society from the inside and yet has developed the consciousness to critically evaluate all that he sees. Sidoroff, however, remains very much a Homo Sovieticus, and the very way in which he chooses to describe things provides insights into his thinking patterns.

The views offered here are, therefore, those of one American and one Soviet. As such they are limited by the experiences and reflections of these two individuals. Their opinions are stated boldly and are intended to provoke discussion and disagreement. This is so because the paramount objective of this cultural supplement is to alert the Russian language student to the existence of differences in attitudes and behavioral patterns and norms between the two societies. This is a "consciousness-raising" activity designed to make students more sensitive towards cultural and genre differences and teachers more conscientious in pointing them out throughout their language courses.

We believe strongly that no foreign language can effectively be taught in a cultural vacuum.

As stated above, we welcome any and all disagreement with the wording or content of any individual statement found in Mark Smith's Diary. Our goal is not to uncover indisputable "truths" about a given society. It is only to provoke discussion, to cultivate the habit of observing the role of the cultural component in communication, and to generate the desire to expand intercultural consciousness.

The topics covered in Mark Smith's Diary correspond to the central themes of the language text they were designed to supplement. As a result, certain important cultural differences in mentalities such as the difference between the Russian/Soviet vs. the American attitude towards literature receives only brief mention, while other information which may not be strictly attitudinal in nature is given greater attention.

This also explains the absence of topics which need to be examined if cross-cultural study is to be comprehensive. We, therefore, wish to emphasize again that we perceive our role to be that of cross-cultural difference "consciousness raisers" and not necessarily that of compilers of a definitive study of the differences between American and Soviet societies.

Since Nikolai is quoted in Russian, his comments appear in later lessons. Each lesson's cultural supplement is accompanied by a quiz designed to both provoke discussion as well as to focus attention on the influence of culture and genre on language use.

Natalia Lord
Boris Shekhtman

1983 - 1985

2.
Начало дневника
(Reasons for the Diary)

Once after completing my daily task of looking through *Pravda*, I picked up a fairly recent "Style" section of the *Washington Post* that my colleague had left on his desk. I found myself reading it from the point of view of a Soviet. How strange it seemed!

First, there was an Art Buchwald article on the difficulties that a nondriver faces in America. A person in our society who doesn't drive is considered an oddity and has difficulty getting checks cashed without a driver's license. What a strange thing to read if you come from a society where only a small number of people drive cars and where everyone has an internal passport and no difficulty in cashing checks because there simply aren't any. No credit cards, either.

The next article I read was an interview with two college students who had posed nude for *Playboy*. That article would seem very strange indeed to a Soviet--first, because there are no magazines with nude photographs at all in the Soviet Union and second, because full-time college students are usually a select group and thus serious-minded young people.

In another newspaper I read about something called college C.D.'s. The College Board and the College Savings Bank of Princeton N.J. are issuing C.D.'s that will pay annual interest rates matching annual college inflation rates. It mentions that parents of a 5-year-old in 1987 could invest $59,951.90 today and have enough to pay the $181,000 that a four-year education will cost in the years 2000 to 2004--if costs continue rising at a 10% annual rate. A Soviet reading that article would of course sigh with relief that his or her own children's college education won't cost a kopeck.

After realizing how odd these "normal" features of American life would seem from a *Soviet* viewpoint, I decided to take special notice of the things that struck me as different about life in the Soviet Union from an *American* point of view. Some of the entries in my diary are notes I took simply to help myself and my wife Margaret better understand our new environment. Others are accounts of our adventures, both separately and together, that occurred while we were in the Soviet Union. Finally, there are observations and recommendations I made in a deliberate attempt to alter my own thinking and behavior so that my Soviet acquaintances and I would have fewer misunderstandings.

Not all of our experiences were pleasant--in fact, some were embarrassing. Others, however, such as the example I am about to give, were lots of fun:

> Today, while on a walk through our neighborhood, I passed a group of people who were arguing about something. They seemed to be trying to agree upon a number. They each in turn counted something on their fingers. Three of them came out with four and the other two finished counting at three. What struck me while I watched them was that each one started his counting on his pinkie and folded his fingers into his palm. Americans, in general, do not count this way.
>
> Thus began my collection of differences.

3.
Знакомство
(Meetings and Greetings)

Americans who have walked down the streets of Moscow often comment on the stern, unsmiling expressions on Russian faces. I began to understand this phenomenon after I was told that one simply does not smile at strangers. It is also considered indecent for a woman to smile at a man whom she does not know, since to smile under these circumstances is obvious flirtation.

Soon after being introduced to the Russian personnel at the Embassy, I started to say 'hi' to them whenever we met. One day my greeting evoked a surprising response: **«Мы с вами ведь уже здоровались.»** I could not figure out what that had to do with anything until a Russian acquaintance told me that it is not customary to greet one another formally more than once a day. **«Здравствуйте»** is the most formal greeting.

I was also embarrassed to learn that I had offended someone because I had asked **«Как вы поживаете?»** and continued walking past him without waiting for his reply. Apparently saying **«Как дела?»** as a greeting instead of a question is more or less ok, but not **«Как вы поживаете?»**.

Another thing that seems startling at first is the sight of two women walking arm in arm down the street. Seeing men hug and kiss each other in greeting, sometimes three times, also took some getting used to. I simply had to stop looking at this with "American" eyes. In the Soviet Union this is simply normal behavior when expressing friendship. I also saw many young people walking down the street arm in arm. Not only girl and boy, but two boys together or two girls. I also saw high-school aged young men walking arm in arm down the street with their mothers. What American high schooler would consider that normal?

On the subject of meeting, greeting, and the exchange of small talk, it also took me quite some time to get used to the proper use of **«ты»** and **«вы»**. Both Margaret and I spent a great deal of time eavesdropping and asking questions to figure out the rules of **«ты»** and **«вы»** usage. Nikolai helped to provide some of the answers: **«вы»** is always safe for starting out. If the persons are of similar age and position and hit it off well, it is always possible to drink to 'brudershaft' (brotherhood). This entails crossing arms and downing a drink. After that little ceremony is complete, you may officially switch to **«ты,»** although most do so by simply saying: **«Давайте перейдём на ты.»** I found it best to always leave the initiative to the Russian. Irate salespeople sometimes addressed us as **«ты.»** Margaret said that she found it best in those cases to respond as politely as possible using the **«вы»** form. Since it is a sign of respect, it has a much more calming effect. **«Ты»** is generally reserved for relatives, children, very close friends, or fellow schoolmates. It is a very definite sign of intimacy. When addressing an adult with whom you are not well acquainted as **«ты»**, what you are doing is the equivalent of slapping him or her on the back and saying, "How ya doing, buddy?" When I was in Leningrad as a student, there were many more people whom I addressed as **«ты»** than there are now that I am at the Embassy. These days I try to limit my use of **«ты»** to children and pets.

Margaret and I used to keep a list of all the corrections that we received from **babushkas** while walking down the street. It included comments such as: **«Молодой человек, почему вы без шапки?»** or **«Вы что, не видите, что здесь нельзя переходить улицу?»** At first we simply couldn't believe how rude people were. I mentioned this to Kolya, indignantly saying, "At least in America strangers don't usually butt into people's business on the street." He countered with, "Yes, I heard about how more than forty New Yorkers watched a girl being raped and not one of them even bothered to call the police." When I asked him to explain how the two things were connected, he replied that both calling the police when one witnesses a crime and telling someone off when they break a traffic law or warning someone that they may get sick because they are improperly dressed are attempts at 'righting' a wrong. He also said that Soviets are taught from kindergarten on to feel responsible for the collective. This means minding other people's business. Well, I still find it very annoying and rude for strangers to bark corrections at me in the street, but I suppose it helps to know that this type of behavior can at times be a crime deterrent.

Among friends at the university I often heard comments such as, "If I were you, I wouldn't wear that color, it makes you look so pale." It is not considered to be rude, nor is the intent at all malicious. The person who says things like that is convinced that s/he is expressing concern. Most Americans I know find it difficult to accept these comments in the spirit in which they were intended. We value privacy so highly that these remarks are considered an intrusion. We tend to think that if a person really wishes us well, they would leave us alone, whereas the Russians whom I know express their concern for their friends by freely commenting on their appearance and behavior.

Quiz

Прочитайте «Дневник Марка Смита» и выполните все задания по-русски.

1. You are not on terribly good terms with a Soviet who lives near you. You still wish to greet him, however, but not in a way that would encourage further conversation. What would you say that would be a formal greeting?
2. You meet an acquaintance on the street who is walking with her four-year-old daughter.
   a. Greet the mother.
   b. Greet the little girl.
   c. Ask the little girl what her name is.
3. Two Soviets with whom you work walk by as you are speaking with a third. The person speaking to you greets one of those going by but not the other. What explanation would you expect him/her to give for not greeting the other person?
4. You have become friendly with a Moscovite. You enjoy this person's company and feel awkward constantly addressing him/her in a formal way. What would you say to change that?
5. You are standing at a bus stop minding your own business when a Soviet comes up to you and tells you angrily that you should be wearing a scarf when it is so cold out. Rate the following people from most to least likely (1-4) to be the one to deliver such a lecture.

   ____ милиционер
   ____ генерал
   ____ бабушка
   ____ студент

4.
Покупки
(Shopping and Money)

After hearing about the pervasive rudeness of salespeople and cashiers in Soviet stores and businesses, Margaret was particularly nervous on her first shopping trip. Back home, merchants have a tendency to be short-tempered with people who speak broken English. In the Soviet Union, however, foreigners for the most part receive better than average treatment. Since Russians are (often from afar) enamored of foreigners and know how difficult their language is, they tend to be understanding and patient with those of us who haven't quite mastered it yet. This doesn't mean that Margaret was never yelled at by a Soviet salesclerk, but she insists that it was not because she was a foreigner.

When trying on clothing in a store, customers are supposed to hang everything back on the rack, not leave it in the **кабина**. I once heard a stern: **«А кто за вас вешать будет?»** Obviously, the salesclerk did not consider putting clothes back part of her job.

As I said earlier, Margaret and I were sometimes yelled at by the cashiers or salespeople while shopping. For a while, I approached cashiers with trepidation. Then I realized that everyone else had their money ready when they dealt with the cashier, while I usually had to hunt for mine. When I began to talk to the cashier with money in hand, things went much more smoothly. If I had trouble understanding a price, the cashier could point to the right amount in my hand. Moreover, cashiers didn't seem to mind this--what upset them was having to wait while I looked for my money!

The man who sells meat in a nearby **«гастроном»** is one of the rudest that Margaret has ever encountered. We were totally amazed when we ran into him this Sunday afternoon in the park. It turns out that we live on the same block. He was in the park with his children and was almost unrecognizable. He was as friendly and well-mannered as one could wish. Since one of his children asked one of ours for gum, we got into a long conversation. When Margaret went to buy meat from him later this week, she again saw him snarl and bark at his customers. When her turn came, although he did not turn into his Sunday self, he did give her a nod, a sort of wink, and a better piece of meat. This was not because she was a foreigner, either, since this happened toward the end of our tour when she had begun to blend into the crowd somewhat more. It was simply because he now knew her.

Once, in the spring, on a particularly nice day, I decided to eat my lunch in the park. After finishing some yogurt, I put the container on the park bench next to me. A slightly inebriated man came up to me and asked, **«посуда вам нужна?»** Since I had learned that **«посуда»** meant "china," I couldn't figure out what he wanted. He explained that the glass jars that **кефир** (similar to yogurt) comes in, as well as bottles for milk, cream, liquor, jelly, and canned vegetables, can all be turned in for a sizeable refund.

Turning in **кефир** and milk bottles may take most of the day, but it is definitely an interesting experience. Quite often the rules governing this process change, so it is important to keep up-to-date. Only certain types of jars or bottles are accepted on particular days in a specific location. Be sure to clean them thoroughly before trying to turn them in.

Although the entire process is a challenge, to say the least, it is a wonderful opportunity to rub elbows with Russians--and it is economically rewarding. You get half of the purchase price back when returning **кефир** bottles. It is usually preferable to save jelly jars for buying **сметана** (similar to sour cream), since it is not prepackaged and the customer is required to provide his/her own container. **«Стекло»** and **«тара»** are also used when talking about these

10

jars and bottles.

In addition to collections of jars, there are also collections of old paper--old books, magazines, and newspapers, or **«макулатура»**, which can be turned in for **талоны**. Without these **талоны**, it is impossible to purchase certain popular books which are in short supply. I once met two young men who were trying to scrounge up enough old printed matter to be able to purchase copies of the works of Kipling and Jules Verne.

Although money is usually a very sensitive topic in every culture, I found that the role it plays in the Soviet Union is somewhat less important than in the U.S. There is so much less money around, and so little to buy with it, that it loses some of its significance. In addition to the tradition of looking down upon money for money's sake, other factors have contributed to the loss of money's prestige.

For us, money is the means of acquiring the accoutrements of a comfortable lifestyle, such as apartments or houses, cars, home computers, and fancy vacations. A fat bank account is also considered an insurance policy for the future, as it helps us to safeguard what we have acquired. In the Soviet Union, money alone usually cannot do these things. Non-monetary considerations are often more important. One acquires the available "better" things more often through connections than by simply paying for them. Although the saying **«Не имей сто рублей, а имей сто друзей»** is a traditional one, it is still very true for people in the Soviet Union today. **Блат** (connections) are needed to get an apartment without waiting for ten years. They help get a **путёвка** for a vacation. They are useful for repairing one's car, and for getting genuine Levis or Wranglers. **Взятки** (bribes) and the exchange of goods play an important role in the acquisition of services and goods. Bribes are not always monetary. The attraction of foreign goods, clothing, tape recorders, appliances, books, etc., cannot be overemphasized. People are really hungry to have these items not only because they are generally of a higher quality than articles produced in the USSR, but also because of their prestige, and the psychological sense of superiority that their possessors often feel.

In general, goods that are scarce--liquor and imported items--have more buying power than money. Therefore, anyone who has access to meat, foreign clothing, or any other deficit item has more power than anyone having only cash.

Quiz

Прочитайте «Дневник Марка Смита» и выполните все задания по-русски.

1. You are in a store, and the clerk is being particularly obnoxious. You are not in the mood for this today and want to modify this clerk's behavior. What would you say to him or her--in Russian, of course?

2. Rate the following according to their degree of politeness. (1 for most polite, 4 for least)

    ____ Вам чего?

    ____ Ты, что тебе надо?

    ____ Что вы хотите?

    ____ Что бы вы хотели?

3. How do you think a Russian friend would rate the following gifts? (1 for most desirable, 4 for least)

    ____ биография М.С. Горбачёва

    ____ джинсы

    ____ 5 рублей

    ____ талон за 20 кг макулатуры

4. Which of the following pairs would be most likely to have a rude exchange in the USSR?

    доктор - пациент

    продавец - покупатель

    ученик - учитель

    офицер - солдат

5.
Семья
(Families)

Our son Gregory was three years old when we went to Moscow, so Margaret frequently took him to the park near the Embassy. There she often spoke with Russian parents and grandparents about children and their upbringing in the Soviet Union.

Because the political ideology of the Soviet Union expects obedience from its people, parents, in their turn, expect their children to obey and learn to do the "right" thing. They feel that a child must learn early what is proper behavior and what is not. They view socialization as learning to conform to norms which include eating properly, dressing oneself properly, sharing toys, and obeying grownups without protest. For example:

—Toilet training is almost always completed before the child is one year old. (Margaret was glad that we got to Moscow when we did, because she said that she would have been embarrassed ordering Pampers for a two-and-a-half year old--not to mention that they would have had to be brought in from abroad!)

—Children of three or four are usually expected to hold their forks properly when eating and to cut their meat by themselves.

—It is considered more important for preschoolers to "behave" properly in the collective than to develop individuality or the ability to express themselves.

—The proper upbringing of future citizens is considered officially to be the primary goal of Soviet schools, outranking education per se.

When it comes to raising children to become future citizens, all Soviets feel responsible and involved. Margaret was surprised by the amount of attention that Gregory received from strangers. Often when she entered a crowded bus with him, someone would immediately say: "Let the mother with the small child sit down." Usually two or three people would jump up and offer their seats. Since Margaret had ridden New York subways until two days before she delivered Gregory and claims that she never even received a half-hearted offer of a seat, she was thoroughly amazed by this behavior. She said that this was one aspect of Soviet life that she could get used to. Conversely, if Russian school-aged children do something in public that is considered improper, such as smoking, fighting among themselves, or not giving up their seats on the bus to an elderly person or a mother with a small child, a chorus of reprimands is showered upon them. Everyone considers it his or her business to correct children, no matter whose they are, and to tell them the proper way to behave. We saw uncomfortable-looking ten-year-olds having to endure up to five minutes of grumbling from total strangers.

Once when Margaret was walking in the park with our son, he threw a cookie wrapper on the ground just as they were passing people of various ages sitting on benches, enjoying the sun. Almost all of them made comments. Not only was Gregory corrected, but Margaret as well for not disciplining him sooner. Due to the way Russian children are taught to behave in public, Russian adults often perceive American kids as quite wild.

Soviet parents begin disciplining their children at a very early age. Some of them consider swaddling, which is still practiced in the Soviet Union, to be a part of the disciplining process. Since children are entirely bound with swaddling clothes, they are not as free to explore with their fingers and hands or to kick their legs at will. Although, from what I have been told, the main goal of swaddling is to provide security and protection for the infant, some people feel that it is good for the baby to get used to physical restraints since it prepares him or her for being strictly disciplined mentally and socially later. In any case, swaddling is no longer as popular as it used to be.

In general, we found that although small children are much cuddled and loved and fussed over and are always given candy by strangers, they are taught to "mind their manners" from a very early age. It is considered very important for them to behave properly, to obey their elders, to speak only when spoken to, and to remain quiet and still in public places. Margaret once saw a family having a picnic where a little girl, who was no more than four years old, reached out and put her finger in the sour cream jar. Her mother, without raising her voice, matter-of-factly made the child sit apart from the rest of the family and she was not allowed to have anything to eat until everyone else had finished eating. What's more, other family members, including the other children and the grandparents, told her how poorly she had behaved and how rude it was to put one's finger into food that everyone would be eating. Her crying was ignored and she was totally ostracized for almost an hour. Since this incident made such an impression on Margaret, she asked some of our Russian friends about it. Not one of them seemed to think that the parents' reactions were unusually harsh or that the punishment was too severe.

Soviet parents are amazed by how independent American teenagers are. The fact that so many of our teenagers hold jobs and own cars really shocks them. They think that work will interfere with their children's studies and that it is beneath the dignity of a serious young person headed for college or already in college to do such menial work as babysitting, working at a store, or being an usher in a theater. Russian parents feel that it is their responsibility to support their children financially while they are in school, no matter how old the children are.

Most grown children, whether married or not, continue to live with their parents both because of housing shortages and custom. The result is that most parents continue to have very close relationships with their sons and daughters. It was hard for our Russian friends to understand why my twenty-year-old brother had his own apartment and lived in a city hundreds of miles away from our parents, even though he was not married. And for Russians who emigrate to our country, America's ways are often difficult. I remember once meeting a recent Soviet émigré who complained bitterly that he was no longer able to see his son every day. "Why did I come here? To see my son only once a month? What's the sense in that?"

P.S. Little Gregory received lots of presents from our Russian acquaintances. Wanting to reciprocate, Margaret once gave a present to Kolya's wife, who was expecting her second child in the very near future. Although she accepted the gift, she acted as though Maggie had done something wrong. When we asked others about this, we found out that it is considered by some to be bad luck to buy anything for a child before it is born. It was a good thing that we found this out in time, because Margaret was planning to give Kolya's wife a baby shower!

An American friend, age 4, once started to look in the purse of a woman who stopped to reprimand the parents for not dressing him warmly enough. He had grown accustomed to receiving candy from all of their Russian acquaintances. The American parents were of course mortified that their son would show disrespect for another's private property. The reaction of the Russian lady was not at all what they expected. She apologized repeatedly to the boy for not having any candy for him. She obviously thought that she was in the wrong in this case.

Quiz

Прочитайте «Дневник Марка Смита» и выполните все задания.

1. Read the following summaries of a Russian and an American story. Compare the two stories, noting:
   - а. differences in the authors' intent
   - б. differences in the way in which behavior modification is to be accomplished
   - в. differences in the role of the peer group
2. Retell the Russian story in Russian.

Summary of an American story:

Molly's Moe

Molly's Moe[1], by Kay Chorao, is a children's book dealing with the subject of children who lose their possessions.

Molly has a habit of losing her toys and articles of clothing. Since her mother wishes to help Molly overcome this problem, she proposes the following deal: Molly will accompany her mother on a shopping trip, and if she manages to refrain from losing anything they will buy a special treat at the bakery. Molly is happy to accept the challenge and asks for permission to bring her favorite stuffed animal, Moe, with them. Mother and daughter take inventory after each stop. Nothing is lost. At the final stop, the bakery, they purchase a cake that is decorated with pink roses. Molly has earned her prize.

When they return home, however, they discover that Moe is nowhere to be found. Molly's mother telephones all the stores in an effort to locate Moe, but the toy is not found. Molly is so upset that she cries herself to sleep. In a dream she remembers that Moe has been at the bottom of the shopping bag all along. They celebrate finding Moe by eating the cake. Molly gets the piece with the biggest pink rose on top.

Summary of a Russian story:

Маша-растеряша

Жила-была девочка Маша. Утром она очень не любила вставать. Она всегда опаздывала в детский сад, всегда теряла чулки, носки и туфли. Сегодня утром Маша встала очень поздно и опять опоздала в детский сад. Когда Маша пришла в детский сад, все дети хором сказали ей: «Опоздала, Маша, Маша-растеряша!»

Слова к рассказу

вставать	to get up	**носки**	socks
опаздывать	to be late	**туфли**	shoes
поздно	late	**хором**	in a chorus
чулки	stockings	**растеряша**	one who loses things

3. **«воспитание», «образование»**

   а. Give the English equivalents of the above words.
   б. Explain why **«воспитание»** is considered to be the number one goal of the Soviet school system.

4. The following Russian statements are taken from or based on the text. You are to determine if they are **«правильно»** (true) or **«неправильно»** (false).

   ________________ а. Когда Смит приехал в Москву, его сыну было четыре года.

   ________________ б. Беременным женщинам в СССР дарят детскую одежду.

   ________________ в. В Советском Союзе к детям относятся с большим вниманием.

   ________________ г. Когда Маргарита вошла в автобус с маленьким сыном, ей не уступили место.

   ________________ д. Пожилой иммигрант из СССР сказал: «Я рад, что мой сын живёт отдельно.»

5. Graduates of a particular educational institution often bear the stamp of that institution, just as products of a particular system of upbringing reflect that upbringing. Products of Soviet schools inevitably reflect the educational philosophy practiced in those schools. What possible influence can the following phenomenon found in Soviet schools have on its charges?

   а. Нет частных школ.

   б. Нет выбора предметов.

   в. В каждой школе есть пионерская и комсомольская организация.

   г. Религия полностью запрещена во всех учебных заведениях.

   д. Введено обязательное трудовое обучение.

6.
Театр
(Theater)

Margaret and I are both theater and music lovers and make good use of the terrific opportunities that Moscow theaters provide. The variety and quality of theatrical entertainment rivals that of New York or London, while ticket prices are much lower. But certain things are a bit different about theater-going in Moscow:

> —Coat checking is compulsory. If you don't want a scene, don't try to bring your coat into the hall with you. Also, after we were yelled at repeatedly because our coats fell on the floor of the **гардероб,** we finally sewed loops inside our coat collars so that they would stay when hung on hooks. That proved to be a smart move.
>
> —As in Europe, one has to pay for a program in the theater--they are not given out free. Binoculars may be rented from the coat checker for a small fee, usually 50 kopecks or a ruble. If you rent binoculars, you can get your coat more quickly after the performance, since people holding them go to the front of the line.
>
> —Russians walk to their seats with their backs to the stage because it is considered rude to walk with one's back to someone. Once when we were very politely saying "excuse us" as we made our way to our seats with our backs to those already seated, we heard, "Don't they ever teach those foreigners any mannners?" Of course, people at home think that you are violating their personal space if you rub knees with them as you make your way to your seat in the middle of the aisle.
>
> —Russian audiences are very demonstrative. Performers are almost always showered with flowers and greeted with rhythmic applause, and their names are shouted at the end of a performance.

Despite the great love that Russians feel for their best dancers, singers, actors, movie stars, and athletes, they also respect the privacy of these celebrities. This was baffling to me since, as I have mentioned before, the average person on the street is at the mercy of others who feel completely free to make comments on behavior, to reprimand, or to ask any stranger for a cigarette.

It is unfortunate that most foreigners miss what is probably *the* most interesting thing about theaters in the Soviet Union. Plays often become political events. That's quite a statement. Let's see how I can explain it. In the first place, literature, poetry, and drama historically have played a very important role in Russian life. Poets and writers are practically worshipped and looked up to almost as prophets who reveal the truth about life and people. Some especially-loved poets and writers are very nearly cult figures--everyone wants to know what they have to say. Playwrights are in the same category but, because their work is subject to strict censorship, the number of plays considered significant for their revelations of the truths left unsaid elsewhere in Soviet society has been small.

One such play was **«Правду, только правду»**. In it the author uses hints or **«намёки»** to make his point. He writes about significant figures in the history of world culture who fought for freedom of expression and were repressed by their respective societies. So, everyone understands that while Jonathan Swift is the hero of the play, he is a symbol for all authors and poets who have experienced difficulties. When Swift cries out: «Правду, только правду!» the audience is electrified. During the run of this play, audiences flocked to it as one would to a "happening." The excitement was palpable.

Many directors, wishing to make a significant and truthful statement, have turned to classical works of world drama. In these productions, when Hamlet criticizes Denmark, people in the audience are convinced that he is really taking a swipe at the leadership of the USSR. These productions are tremendously popular and also politically significant. Since they are classical works of literature, however, for the most part they are acceptable to the censor and thus a convenient device.

Прочитайте «Дневник Марка Смита» и выполните все задания.

1. In your opinion, who are the five greatest Americans that ever lived? Write down your list and compare it with the lists of your colleagues. Then,

   a. Ask your instructor to give his or her opinion of the five greatest Russians. Ask your instructor to tell you which Russians were named most often when all of the instructors had to make up such a list.

   б. Compare the lists of great Americans and great Russians.

2. You are at a performance of **Spartacus** at the Bolshoi, danced by Ekaterina Maximova and Vladimir Vassiliev. What might you hear the Russians around you shout at the end of the performance?

3. Read the following Russian statements, which are taken from or based on the text. Indicate whether they are **«правильно»** (true) or **«неправильно»** (false).

   ______________ а. Когда русским нравится спектакль, они не аплодируют, а свистят.

   ______________ б. В Советском Союзе постановка пьесы может стать политическим событием.

   ______________ в. Русские никогда не проходят между рядами спиной к сидящему.

   ______________ г. Если вы хотите взять бинокль напрокат, вам нужно обратиться к директору театра.

   ______________ д. Зрители в СССР очень редко преподносят цветы актрисам и актёрам.

4. Read the following statement and answer the question:

   Пьеса содержит политический намёк.

   Is it attractive to

   a. Soviet audiences? ____________________

   б. American audiences? ____________________

7.
На улицах Москвы
(On the Streets of Moscow)

WHAT MAKES WALKING DOWN GORKY STREET DIFFERENT FROM WALKING DOWN FIFTH AVENUE?

Just a few impressions after a walk in downtown Moscow:

—The crowds are bigger. In fact, sidewalk traffic follows the same rules as vehicular traffic. One walks on the right side of the sidewalk if one wishes to avoid getting trampled. People push more. It takes a lot more to violate body space in Moscow than at home. People are less likely to apologize when they bump into you. Since Russians don't smile at strangers, the crowd looks somewhat gloomy to me.

—One can see people of the same or opposite sexes walking arm in arm or hand in hand.

—People on Moscow streets seem much less likely to talk loudly, flaunt their feelings, sing, or carry radios. You don't see Sony Walkmans either.

—There aren't as many people in strange get-ups or people with obvious mental problems. In the Soviet Union, treatment of mental problems is not on a voluntary basis. Anyone with difficulties is removed from the society and treated. One does not sign himself or herself out of a mental clinic the way one can in the States.

—There are no beggars or bag ladies on Gorky Street. One does, however, see beggars near churches.

—People with physical handicaps are much less visible. There are very few handicapped people in the work force or participating in events in public. There are no kneeling buses, ramps for wheelchairs, or special toilets in public restrooms. Equipment for the handicapped is usually handmade and very rudimentary. It is possible to see a legless person in a low sitting cart pushing himself or herself along by hand. Sometimes one sees wheelchairs that look like giant baby carriages. Technically sophisticated accoutrements for the handicapped to help them take part in public life don't exist. Children with physical handicaps are not mainstreamed into the public school system as they are in the States.

—Street vendors' goods are different. One wouldn't expect to pick up a leather briefcase, a set of knives, or a turtleneck sweater from a sidewalk vendor on Gorky Street, just as one would not find **квас, пирожки**, canned peas, or chicken on Fifth Avenue.

—I didn't see any people soliciting for a cause, collecting signatures on petitions, or religious groups trying to recruit members. I missed such colorful individuals as the man on Fifth Avenue who carries a sign reading "Husband's Lib." But then, one certainly doesn't see any "Glory to the USA" banners in mid-Manhattan, either.

—There are many more well-dressed people who are drunk--especially near liquor stores. Officially liquor stores are not allowed to sell vodka after 7 p.m., even though they are open until 9 p.m. This is done in an effort to reduce the number of people getting drunk in the streets. From what I have seen, it didn't seem to help. If an intoxicated person fell down in the street he or she was usually picked up and promptly taken to a detox center, although I used to encouter a fair number of drunks asleep on the street. Now, one finds the streets almost devoid of drunks, although much drinking continues to occur indoors.

(The seriousness with which Mr. Gorbachev views the drinking problem can be attested to by the change to dry political receptions.)

—There are more strangers asking for cigarettes or a light. In fact, it is considered very rude in Moscow to light up without offering a cigarette to whomever you are talking with. American cigarettes are very good for getting attention, starting conversations, or as tips, gifts, and/or bribes.

—A foreigner from a non-Socialist country immediately attracts attention. Most Russians just stare, but those willing to speak to foreigners usually want to: a) give them a **значок**, b) sell them icons, c) buy their jeans, d) exchange the foreigner's currency for rubles, or e) simply ask them about life abroad and/or tell them what they know about life abroad.

—Unlike Fifth Avenue stores, Gorky Street stores and most businesses of all kinds close for lunch. These lunchtime closings can be from 12-1, 1-2, or 2-3 p.m.

—Many more people walk down the street carrying packages or large bags of some sort with purchases.

—Pedestrians are not allowed to cross streets in certain areas. There are pedestrian underpasses for this purpose. In fact, a pedestrian may be fined if s/he is caught crossing a large and busy street where an underpass is available. The pedestrian does not have the right of way in Moscow. Even if s/he is hurt, s/he may be ticketed or even jailed.

—Moscow has a greater variety of public transportation than New York. There are trams and trolleys in addition to buses and subways. These are always crowded. There are fewer private cars, but more trucks of all sorts. Since horn blowing is only allowed in emergencies and not simply to vent frustrations, there is somewhat less of it in Moscow than in New York.

—Drivers usually feel superior to pedestrians. They represent an elite minority and act the part. They aren't like everyone else just trying to get to work, as in the United States.

—Fancy sports cars attract a great deal of attention. A friend of mine with a Corvette usually found that a crowd of people would gather everywhere he went. Sometimes Americans get tired of answering the same questions about their cars. Once a colleague of mine put up a little sign in the window of his car with answers to the most commonly asked questions. He mentioned the horsepower, the model, its cost, and the length of time it would take an average American worker to earn the necessary money to purchase it. His car was vandalized within a week. No use rubbing it in.

—Once I was nearly rear-ended when a **«милиционер»** ('miliman' as a militia man is called by Americans in Moscow). stopped all the traffic on a major thoroughfare in Moscow to yell at someone for having a dirty car. This was in the fall. It had been raining and the road was extremely slippery. The car behind me went into a skid. Milimen do things like that quite often, by the way.

On the next page we will deal with some of the typical conversations one may encounter on a Soviet street. The right column contains questions, and the left column contains answers or

responses typical for short exchanges on the street. Practice these with the help of your instructor.

Short Street Conversations

1.

—Что дают?	—Ничего.
—Куда все бегут?	—Сам не знаю.
—Что случилось?	—А кто его знает?
—Что происходит?	—Задавили кого-то.
—В чём дело?	—Кажется, что-то дают.
—Что за шум?	—Вроде встречают какую-то делегацию.
	—Бог его знает.

2.

—Закурить, приятель, не найдётся?	—Возьмите, пожалуйста.
—У вас закурить есть?	—Извините, я не курящий.
—Извините, пожалуйста, у вас нет спичек?	—Простите, не курю.
—Простите, не подкинете ли огонька?	

3.

—Вы не разменяете рубль (двадцать копеек)?	—Вот, пожалуйста.
	—К сожалению, у меня нет мелочи.
—Извините, у вас нет мелочи?	—Пожалуйста, возьмите.
—Простите, у вас не будет двух копеек? Нужно срочно позвонить.	—Что вы, возьмите так. Не беспокойтесь.

4.

—Гражданин, вы последний?	—Да, но за мной занимали.
—Вы уже долго стоите? Извините, я отойду на минутку.	—Я только что подошёл.
	—Пожалуйста, только возвращайтесь скорее.

Quiz

Прочитайте «Дневник Марка Смита» и выполните все задания.

1. Read the following Russian statements which are taken from or based on the text. Indicate whether they are or **«правильно»** or **«неправильно»**.

   ______________ а. На улицах Москвы много красивых спортивных машин самых современных марок.

   ______________ б. В центре Москвы очень часто встречаются люди, раздающие листовки религиозного содержания.

   ______________ в. В Москве общественный транспорт не имеет специальных приспособлений для инвалидов.

   ______________ г. В Москве очень редко увидишь пьяного.

   ______________ д. Психически больные люди живут прямо на улицах Москвы.

2. Translate the following political slogans into English:

   а. СЛАВА КПСС!
   б. НАРОД И ПАРТИЯ—ЕДИНЫ!
   в. ЛЕНИН—ВСЕГДА ЖИВОЙ!
   г. ДА ЗДРАВСТВУЕТ СОВЕТСКИЙ НАРОД—СТРОИТЕЛЬ КОММУНИЗМА!
   д. МИРУ—МИР!

3. Translate the following into Russian:

   а. What's going on?

   ____

   б. Sorry, I don't smoke.

   ____

   в. Excuse me, would you happen to have two kopecks?

   ____

   г. Here it is.

   ____

4. Respond in Russian to the following:

   а. Вы последний? Что дают?
   б. Вы разве здесь стояли?
   в. У вас есть спички?
   г. Что случилось?
   д. Вы будете стоять? Я отойду на минутку.

In which country are the following conversations most likely to occur--the USSR or the U.S.?

1.

—Предъявите, пожалуйста, ваши водительские права.
—А что случилось?
—Во-первых, у вас очень грязная машина; во-вторых, вы едите во время движения.

2.

—Гражданин!
—Да, в чём дело?
—Здесь переходить дорогу нельзя, пользуйтесь подземным переходом.

3.

—Какой марки ваша машина?
—Форд «Гренада».
—Сколько цилиндров?
—Шесть.

8.
Ресторан
(Restaurant)

Just as American kids don't go to Chuck E. Cheese because they want to eat pizza, Russians don't go to restaurants simply to eat dinner. As parents know, Chuck E. Cheese fans go for the amusements, the circus-like atmosphere, and the video games. Moscovites go to a restaurant to celebrate, to socialize, to do business, to hear loud, popular music, and to dance. (Maybe that's why in both places you have to wait so long for the food.) Also, going to a restaurant is not something that every Russian does. Most often restaurant-goers tend to be the political elite, actors, underground Georgian businessmen, and the intelligentsia.

Shortly after arriving in Moscow, Margaret and I went to a restaurant to celebrate our wedding anniversary. We conducted ourselves there in the same manner that we would have in a restaurant at home. It simply didn't work.

First, because she was wearing her expensive new coat, Margaret didn't want to check it. This caused quite a problem, and finally she had to give it up. Then, we only ordered coffee to drink with our meal since we were planning to have champagne at our apartment later. We also asked for ice water. We continued to commit one faux pas after another as we complained to the waiter that the music was too loud for us and that we had to wait too long for dessert. And finally, Margaret didn't want to dance with a Georgian who had sent a bottle of champagne to our table. (Come to think of it, maybe it was I who didn't like the idea too much!)

After this (by Russian standards) disastrous experience we gradually learned the proper attitudes and behavior for successful dining in the Soviet Union. Nikolai and other Russian friends coached us so that the next time we went out we behaved in a much more **культурный** ("civilized") manner and, consequently, had a much better time. For instance, we learned that drinking and going with a group are both important aspects of going to a restaurant, so the next time we went out we went with a group, and our goal was not simply to get dinner but to have fun. We ordered vodka. Now, the proper way to enjoy this drink requires something to eat with it, good company and many toasts. When the vodka is ice cold and has been doctored with lemon or grapefruit peel, buffalo grass, or even tea, it is a deliciously smooth drink. We made numerous toasts to peace, friendship, each other, all of the members of each of our families, etc. The more we drank, the louder our conversation became and the more appropriate the volume of the music seemed. Margaret enjoyed dancing with the men who asked her, and I no longer was ready to punch out every guy who asked me if he could invite my **дама** to dance. I was even flattered whan a dance was announced "for the lovely lady in blue sitting under the chandelier" (Margaret), particularly since the man who requested it also sent us a huge box of chocolates. Those chocolates cost at least three times as much in a restaurant as in a store.

Although when we went to restaurants we usually had reservations, the few times we didn't we found it sufficient to tip the doorman to get in. Of course, this worked better for us because we were obviously foreigners. If it worked as easily for everyone, there wouldn't be the long lines waiting to get in. (Of course, a *sufficient* tip made in the proper manner works for Soviet citizens, as well. We have seen some people do it on important occasions.)

And speaking of tips, I was impressed by the professional way in which tips at the **гардероб** are handled. It reminds me of the wheel of fortune games at seaside resorts in the States. There is a hidden box running the length of the counter. The **гардеробщик** just sweeps the money off the ledge into it, as though he is sweeping crumbs off a table.

In addition to tipping the waiters with money, we found it expedient to leave small souvenir-type gifts such as copies of **America**, pens, or postcards. These were greatly appreciated by the waiters, especially in cities where we traveled. I remember that at our first meal at our hotel in Kiev we left several such tips. The next evening the waiters were fighting each other for the privilege to serve us. **America** magazine is always highly prized and makes an excellent gift or tip. Since the Embassy's basement is full of them, there is an abundant free supply.

Even though restaurant-going is usually quite a big deal, there **are** places to go if you simply want to eat. These are the specialty restaurants which serve only one or two dishes. There are several different kinds, including **Пельменная, Шашлычная, Пирожковая,** and **Кебабная.**

Since drinking is an important part of going to a restaurant, I am including the following expressions as examples of what one may hear at the table when one person is trying to get another person to drink. As in America, those who choose not to drink when out with a group are considered suspect and quite a bit of pressure is placed on them to participate, even more so than in the United States. Expressions for those not wishing to drink more are also included.

Expressions of Encouragement

—Ты почему не допиваешь?
—Пришёл в ресторан—так пей.
—Ты что же, хочешь, чтобы я пил, а ты—нет? Ты меня уважаешь?
—А, один раз живем. Если пить—так пить. Если пить—так до конца.
—Пей до дна!
—Ничего, один раз можно.
—Ничего, ради такого события можно и выпить.
—Ничего, завтра выходной, на работу не надо.
—Самое главное—не забудь утром опохмелиться.

Expressions of Refusal

—Я уже выпил.
—Это всё. Это моя норма. Две рюмки—мой потолок.
—Мне нельзя пить.

Quiz

Прочитайте «Дневник Марка Смита» и выполните все задания.

1. Examine the following expressions given in the right column, and then connect them to the appropriate categories in the left column.

CATEGORIES

1. Organizing
2. Socializing
3. Showing Attention and Politeness
4. Appreciation
5. Suggestion

EXPRESSIONS

1. Проходите, проходите, пожалуйста.
2. Разрешите, я за вами поухаживаю.
3. Ещё положить?
4. Вы совсем не едите!
5. Вы меня обижаете!
6. Не обманывайте—вы ещё не ели!
7. Давайте споём нашу, русскую.
8. Кто будет тамадой?
9. Ну, теперь ваша очередь.
10. Тише, тише, дайте тост произнести.
11. Пора танцевать!
12. О, господи, ещё одно блюдо!
13. Придётся забыть про диету, уж очень всё вкусно!
14. Вы поёте?
15. Давайте найдём тихое местечко и поговорим.
16. Большое спасибо. Всё было замечательно.
17. Спасибо за компанию! Надеюсь, скоро встретимся у нас.
18. До свидания. Мы очень приятно провели вечер. Спасибо.
19. Вы уже уходите?! Так рано?! Подождите ещё немножко.
20. К сожалению, нам пора идти. Давайте встретимся завтра.

2. Indicate which expressions from the previous exercise you would use at the beginning of an event, during an event, and at the end of an event:

At the beginning	During	At the end

3. You are at a restaurant in Moscow with a group and someone is trying to convince you to drink. For your own reasons you wish to decline--what three Russian expressions could you use if you were in this position?

____

____

____

4. Read the following Russian statements which are taken from or based on the text. Indicate whether they are **«правильно»** or **«неправильно»**.

______________ а. Маргарита не хотела сдавать пальто в гардероб, когда она пришла в ресторан.

______________ б. Советские официанты любят получать сувениры от иностранцев, которых они обслуживают.

______________ в. Марк отметил, что русские не пьют водку.

______________ г. Русские ходят в ресторан только для того, чтобы поесть.

______________ д. Московские рестораны посещаются в основном простыми людьми.

9.
Путешествие
(Travel)

When I first came to the USSR as a student, I was amazed by the average Soviet's attitude towards foreign students and tourists. I felt that I had suddenly gained star status. A friend of mine on the same exchange who spoke nearly native Russian received three marriage proposals within six weeks, and once nearly caused a wreck when she mentioned to the taxi driver that she was from New York. He was so impressed that he swung around to take another look at her, abandoning all thought of steering the car.

Although I have heard many explanations for the Russian's fascination with foreigners, I think that the most important factor is that the majority of Soviet citizens simply cannot travel abroad. Their interest in foreigners is comparable to our own interest should a visitor from another planet, for instance Mars, vacation in the U.S. Our interest would be especially acute if we had no means of reciprocating such visits. We would be eager for the status involved in knowing such a person, and for opportunities to say, "As my friend from Mars was saying the other day . . ." or, "Oh, you like my sweater? It was a present from my friend from Mars. They are very popular there."

Those Soviet citizens who are allowed to travel abroad are in the same privileged category that, say, owners of private airplanes or yachts are in the U.S.

Margaret once suggested that as a joke we try to picture some features of Soviet life as if they existed in the U.S. The following examples illustrate how some aspects of travel would appear:

—Aunt Mary who lives in California comes to visit us in Washington for a month. A few days after Aunt Mary arrives our neighbor Sally comes over and asks if Aunt Mary would like to go with her to the local police station to register her whereabouts.

—We decide to visit New York for the weekend. While most people we know stay with friends or find rented rooms in someone's apartment by word of mouth, or even stay in gymnasiums rather than hotels, we have saved our money and, if we are fortunate enough to find a room available to average citizens, want to experience the luxury of a hotel. Plus, we are hoping for a glimpse of the important members of official delegations or to rub elbows with the many foreigners who frequent the hotels, and for whom rooms are usually available. We naturally take the train, which is the most popular mode of transportation. Since, like most of our friends, we have no credit cards and carry only cash, we put our money in little pouches and hide it somewhere in our underwear. When we check into our hotel the clerk says, "Could I see your passport, please?" When we arrive at our floor we nod to the **дежурная**, who is sitting behind her desk keeping an eye on all guests who come and go. We know that it is her job to account for all the towels, sheets, and blankets in our room at the end of our stay.

—We are to leave for a vacation in Florida the following day when Sally's husband, Frank, comes over and asks us to bring him back some razor blades and a toothbrush for Sally. "As you know, we haven't been able to get them here for some time now," he says. "And I hear they have them in that part of Florida. A guy at work received some the other day from his wife's cousin in Ft. Lauderdale. Her cousin sent some up by way of a train steward on the autotrain. We don't have anyone down there to ask, so I thought you'd be willing. Don't worry--I have a way to repay the favor--your son's application to ice skating school will get special consideration."

—Later in the year Sally drops in and says, "Margaret, could you give me your aunt's address in Camden, Maine? We'd like to spend a month there this summer. We'll make it worth her while, of course. We have several pairs of pantyhose from Czechoslovakia and some smoked sausage. And my friend at the chocolate factory said I could ask her for chocolates any time. I've asked her for that 30-rouble top-of-the-line box of assorted chocolates that's impossible to get anywhere else. I'm sure your aunt will like that."

Most of the factors that differentiate vacation and travel in the U.S. and the USSR have to do with differences in the economic, political, and social conditions prevalent in each country. There are, however, also differences in perceptions and attitudes about travel and vacations, as well as differences in the traditions surrounding these activities.

For instance, Soviet attitudes towards the length of a vacation differ from ours. "A two-week vacation is worse than no vacation at all" was the sentiment expressed by our Russian friends upon learning the average length of American vacations. For them, vacations are considered a necessity rather than a luxury. And theirs are, indeed, much less luxurious. A **дом отдыха** is a pretty spartan place, but when one goes there, one spends a month. Most Soviet workers receive a yearly minimum of 24 vacation days. And many workers receive 48 vacation days annually. Children are sent to pioneer camps, where they breathe fresh air and eat good food for most of the summer, since it is considered unhealthy for them to remain in the cities at that time. The most widely-held attitude in the USSR towards people who take less than a month-long vacation is that they are killing themselves.

Economic conditions make **путёвки** very attractive in the Soviet Union. These are all-expense-paid vacation vouchers to Soviet resorts and are offered to workers through their unions. Because the voucher is only available to the worker and not to his or her family, husbands and wives frequently take separate vacations. A **дом отдыха** becomes a convenient place both for innocent flirtation and for extra-marital affairs.

Economic conditions also make train travel most feasible and most popular for vacationing Russians. The atmosphere on a long-distance train is one of celebration. People are very jovial, frequently sharing their food and drink with compartment mates who are most likely strangers. Strangers of both sexes often share sleepers. The men allow the women the lower berths and leave the compartments while the women change. Chess sets are available for rent A **проводница** (stewardess) or **проводник** (steward) serves hot tea for a small price (a few kopecks) three times a day in a **подстаканник**, a glass with a metal holder. When a station stop lasts 20 to 30 minutes, people get off the train and walk around to see what they can buy to eat or take home.

The **проводница** or **проводник** is a very helpful person in other ways. If you are bringing something from one city to another to sell, she or he will take care of your belongings during the trip, even though this is prohibited. S/he will also take a package to your friends or relatives in another city as a favor. The **контролёр** (ticket-collector) is also a very important person. S/he may let you on board for a bribe if you have no ticket.

One of the traditions concurrent with travel in the Soviet Union is gift-giving. Giving gifts in general on the proper occasion is important with Russians. Most Russians consider it absolutely imperative to give gifts when they visit someone's home, for the birth of a child, on special days such as birthdays, anniversaries, weddings, and on holidays such as New Year's or March 8th, **Международный день женщин** (International Women's Day). They also consider it important whenever they come back from vacation to bring gifts for their family and relatives, their close friends, and even for some of their coworkers. Gifts are also useful as bribes. Many Soviets use them to obtain items or services or privileges to which they are

30

legally entitled but, because of the system, have been unable to obtain. Because bringing back gifts is traditional and because the availability of goods differs from place to place, Russians spend a great deal of their time and effort shopping during vacations. They look for things that are unavailable at home or things that are less expensive than at home. For this reason, returning vacationers are always laden with packages.

By the way, no one ever gets lost in the Soviet Union. The system of **прописка,** required registration, and internal passports makes this virtually impossible.

Quiz

Прочитайте «Дневник Марка Смита» и выполните все задания.

1. Read the following Russian statements which are taken from or based on the text. Indicate whether they are **«правильно»** or **«неправильно»**.

_______________ а. Люди в СССР относятся равнодушно к иностранцам.

_______________ б. В Советском Союзе нет дефицитных товаров.

_______________ в. «Дом отдыха»—это место, где русские учатся иностранным языкам.

_______________ г. Путёвка--это удостоверение, выдаваемое лицу, направляющемуся в санаторий.

_______________ д. У большинства советских людей нет чековых книжек.

2. Do the following exercises in English.

a. Read the following dialogue and explain the cultural differences in English.

На улице

—Привет, ты слышал, что к Карповым приехала родственница из Америки?

—Ну! Представляю, сколько она им навезла!

—Да уж точно! Я вчера видел, как Карпова щеголяла в джинсах.

—Идея! Переговори с ней, может быть, и нам что-нибудь достанется.

—Хорошо, постараюсь, но боюсь, что она загнет умопомрачительную цену.

Слова к диалогу

щеголять	to show off
нам что-нибудь достанется	we'll get some of
она загнёт умопомрачительную цену	she will charge an exorbitant price

б. Read the following dialogue and answer this question: Why did Fyodor Ivanovich not receive a **бесплатная путёвка**?

В профкоме

—Федор Иванович, как там насчет бесплатной путевочки в пионерский лагерь, будет?
—К сожалению, нет, Григорий Петрович, остались только платные путевки, но и они не очень дорогие: профсоюз берет на себя 50% стоимости.
—Как же так, Федор Иванович, ведь вы же обещали—бесплатную?
—Извините, Григорий Петрович, но две последние путевки потребовал партком и, как понимаете, возражать не пришлось.

Слова к диалогу

путёвка	travel pass (all-expense-paid vacation vouchers to Soviet resorts)
возражать не пришлось	we couldn't object

3. Do the following exercises in Russian.

а. Что привёз проводник?

б. Почему проводник сказал: «Нет, всё в порядке!»

На перроне вокзала

—Скажите, пожалуйста, вы проводник второго вагона?
—Да.
—Вам не передавали для меня посылку?
—Возможно. Вы знаете, что в пакете?
—Конечно, там должен быть мед.
—Правильно. Пойдемте со мной . . . Вот, пожалуйста.
—Я вам ничего не должен?
—Нет, все в порядке.

в. Read the following dialogue and explain in Russian why the manager helped the man.

В гостинице

—Добрый день. Вы администратор?
—Да, я.
—Вам привет от Льва Степановича. Он сказал, что вы сможете помочь мне с номером. Я, конечно, не останусь в долгу.
—Вы один?
—О, да, только один.
—Хорошо, тогда мы что-нибудь придумаем. Дайте, пожалуйста, ваш паспорт.
—Это паспорт, а это мой подарочек: здесь великолепная черная икра.
—Большое спасибо, всегда буду рада вас видеть.

Слова к диалогу

Я не останусь в долгу	I'll repay your kindness

10.
Образование
(Education)

The following is a transcript of Mark's conversation with Nikolai. Nikolai's part is, of course, in Russian.

Mark: When I was an IREX grantee, one of my friends in the program was here to study Soviet education. At his invitation, I went with him to observe several Soviet kindergartens and schools, as well as to some of the parent-teacher conferences at the school that his 10-year-old son attended. There are striking differences between our two systems of education, don't you think, Kolya?

Николай: Откровенно говоря, Марк, мне бы не хотелось обсуждать проблему в таком ключе. Я думаю, что это более странноведческий, чем ментальный подход. Мне кажется, интереснее сравнить не столько системы образования двух стран, сколько результаты воздействия этих систем на личность. Вы не возражаете?

Mark: No, of course not. People who matriculate from a particular educational institution or system of education cannot help but bear the stamp of that system or institution. Knowing what the alumni of a school are like gives one insight into that system of education. Conversely, knowing something about an educational system helps one predict the type of graduates that it will produce. What sort of personalities would you say the Soviet system of education produces?

Николай: На этот вопрос я ответил бы так: советская система образования прежде всего выпускает «идеологическую личность». Ведь, скажем прямо, главная цель советского образования не передача учащимся определенной совокупности знаний, а формирование так называемого научного марксистского мировоззрения. Огромное количество всякого рода мероприятий—октябрятские и пионерские сборы, торжественные линейки, встречи с интересными людьми, соревнования и парады, военные игры и фестивали и т.д. рассчитаны на формирование верности официальной идеологии и государственно-партийному аппарату через воздействие на эмоции учащихся. Что все это означает по отношению к отдельной личности? Это означает, что советская «личность» должна верить или, по крайней мере, притворяться, что верит определенным официально утвержденным догмам. Если она этим догмам не верит и даже не делает вид, что верит, то она мгновенно превращается в парию, в жертву, в преследуемое существо.

Mark: What specific ideas are you talking about?

Николай: Ну, Марк, этих идей хватает! Партия и народ едины, в СССР построен социализм, коммунизм—светлое будущее человечества, марксизм—единственная в мире наука об обществе, Америка готовит войну против СССР. Однако дело не в идеях. Дело в том, что советский гражданин в разговоре с вами будет всегда выражать официальную точку зрения, «правильную» точку зрения, одобренную Политбюро точку зрения.

Mark: What are some of the other characteristics of Soviet education that stand out in your mind?

Николай: Что ещё? Я думаю—безынициативность. Когда-то во времена Сталина так прямо и писали: исполнительность есть лучший пример инициативы. Сейчас так не пишут, но реально положение пока не изменилось. Не может быть инициативы там, где нет свободы мысли. Не может быть инициативы в стране, где за тебя думают и принимают решения. Уже с детства в СССР ребенка отучают от выбора, этой основы всякой самостоятельности. Нет выбора предметов в школе, нет выбора на выборах (знаменитый анекдот на эту тему: в портсигаре лежит одна единственная сигарета, предлагающий говорит: «Выбирай!»), наконец, нет выбора товаров (бери, что дают). Следует отметить, что инициатива подавляется и в сфере гуманитарных наук, и в естествознании, и в технике. Мне кажется, что только коренная перемена в советской политико-экономической системе, если она произойдёт, позволит изменить эту ситуацию.

Quiz

На основании информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое предложение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

________________ а. Главная цель советского образования—передача учащимся определённой совокупности знаний.

________________ б. Люди, которые не согласны с официальной идеологией, преследуются в СССР.

________________ в. Обычный советский человек в разговоре с американским дипломатом всегда будет выражать официальную точку зрения.

________________ г. Советское образование воспитывает инициативу.

________________ д. Советские школьники могут выбирать предметы для изучения.

TRANSLATION OF RUSSIAN PORTION OF LESSON ON EDUCATION

Nikolai: Frankly, Mark, I don't think that I would like to discuss the question in that particular vein. I believe that such an approach is appropriate for area studies and not for a study of differences in mentalities. I think that it would be more interesting to compare not so much the systems themselves as the effect that the systems have on forming personalities. You don't object...

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I would answer in the following way. The Soviet system of education first of all produces a person for whom ideology is important. Let's face it, the chief objective of the Soviet educational system is it produce a Marxist Weltanschauung and not to just transmit knowledge. A multitude of staged events are aimed at producing loyalty to the official ideology and the state party apparatus by acting on the emotions of the students. These include assemblies of children involved in the

October organization (young children) and the Pioneers at which each child gives a salute, and various competitions, parades, military games, festivals, and meetings with interesting people, etc. What does all this have to do with the individual personality? This means that a Soviet person must believe, or at least pretend to believe, in certain officially established dogmas. If s/he doesn't believe in these dogmas and doesn't even make an attempt to pretend that s/he does, s/he immediately becomes a pariah, a victim, a persecuted being.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: Well, Mark, there are quite a few--that the party and the people are one, that the USSR has socialism, that communism is the bright future of mankind, that Marxism is the only social science bar none, that America is preparing a war against the USSR, that the problem, however, is not in the ideas themselves. A Soviet citizen in a conversation with you will always express the official point of view, the "correct" Politburo-approved point of view.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: What else? The fear of initiative, for one. During Stalin's time it was often stated in print that the painstaking carrying out of orders was the best example of initiative. One no longer sees that written, but so far the situation is essentially unchanged. There can be no initiative in a country where others think and make decisions for you. A child is taught early not to make choices. And it is upon the making of choices that a sense of independence is contingent. There is no choice of school subjects, there is no choice of candidates during elections, there is a well-known joke in which a person extends to another a cigarette case with one lone cigarette in it. "Choose," he says. There is also little choice in goods (take what is offered). It should be noted that initiative is thwarted both in humanities as well as science and even engineering. I think that only a change in the Soviet political and fundamental economic system, if it occurs, will allow this to be remedied.

11.
Медицина
(Medicine)

Mark: Everyone talks about how expensive medical care is in the U.S. and how in the Soviet Union it is free. Our system is not always as expensive as it may seem--for instance, we have medical insurance, Medicare, and Medicaid. What about your system--is it really always free?

Николай: Медицинское обслуживание в СССР, как известно, бесплатное. Хорошо это или плохо? Я думаю, однозначно ответить на этот вопрос трудно. С одной стороны, конечно, хорошо. Когда вы знаете, что в случае болезни вас всегда будут лечить без копейки денег, когда вы не видите во враче человека, который на вашем горе зарабатывает, когда вы не откладываете деньги на случай болезни, тогда, без сомнения, вы говорите о положительной стороне бесплатной медицины. Однако, с другой стороны, бесплатность медицинской системы, как правило, сопровождается низким качеством лечения и обслуживания, равнодушием к пациенту, усилением взяточничества, созданием ряда специальных поликлиник для привилегированных.

Мне кажется, что значение бесплатности медицинского обслуживания в СССР резко преувеличивается. Более того, я думаю, что чувство гордости, которое испытывают многие советские люди (вот, мол, какая у нас медицина—бесплатная, гуманная, народная, передовая) и которое является сейчас частью советской ментальности, на самом деле необосновано. Бесплатность советской медицины—это просто результат огромной недоплаты заработков как врачам, так и пациентам.

Mark: When I had my appendix out in the U.S. last year, I noticed how comfortable contemporary American hospitals are. I have visited hospitals in other countries and found them to be much more spartan. In American hospitals, trained nurses and staff change a patient's linen at least once a day and provide fresh ice water for each patient. There is a television set, a telephone, and a bathroom in each room, and visitors are allowed to see the patients twice a day. Doctors and hospitals have a huge medical technology industry at their disposal. This includes everything from sophisticated tools for microsurgery and wheelchairs that are operated by the human voice to sophisticated diagnostic prodcedures like CAT scans and the latest in prosthetics. It seems to me that items that in recent years have become standard in many American private practices, clinics, and hospitals--such as disposable syringes, disposable plastic gloves for pelvic exams, disposable examination gowns, and disposable covers for digital thermometers--are now taken for granted by American patients.

Николай: Думается, что советское медицинское обслуживание, по сравнению с американским, просто не выдерживает никакой критики. В больницах, к примеру, постельное белье меняют только один раз в неделю, один единственный туалет может быть рассчитан на 20 и даже на 30 человек, о телефонах и отдельных палатах просто и говорить нечего, оборудование в большинстве больниц—устаревшее, несовременное. Но дело, пожалуй, не только в этом. Поражает непритязательность пациента, его равнодушие к комфорту, его терпимость к условиям, которые бы вызвали резкую критику изнеженного американского больного.

Mark: It seems to me that because pain is considered by many Americans to be as much an enemy as disease, anesthetics and drugs which treat the **symptoms** of a disease are as important as the drugs which treat the disease itself. If a doctor cannot cure a patient, s/he can at least make him or her feel more comfortable. I think that most Americans associate quality medical care with painless medical care. Dentists often use topical anesthetics to make the shot of novocaine itself less painful. I have heard that dentists are quite feared in the USSR precisely because of the pain they inflict. Do you think this is true?

Николай: Да, у нас зубные врачи проводят некоторые болезненные процедуры без наркоза. Трудно объяснить, чем это вызвано. Некоторые говорят—дороговизной анестезии, другие утверждают, что определенные операции, например, удаление нерва, более чисто исполняются, если больной ощущает боль. Я же думаю, что здесь значительную роль играет традиционное отношение к боли как к чему-то, что надо терпеть, традиционное пренебрежение к комфорту. Заметьте, что отсутствие анестезии при абортах и родах—повсеместное явление в СССР.

Mark: Some American hospitals have begun to introduce special telephone "hot lines" with taped information on many medical problems. Intimate problems are discussed in a nonjudgmental manner, both on these tapes and on radio and TV talk shows. Sex education is commonly taught in the public schools and people are being brought up to discuss topics dealing with their bodies more candidly than in the past .

Николай: Я считаю, Марк, что полового воспитания в СССР до сих пор практически нет, и это, вне сомнения, оказывает влияние на ментальность советского человека. Вопросы пола публично не обсуждаются, их как будто не существует, гомосексуализм—опасное уголовное преступление, книг о половой жизни днем с огнем не сыщешь. Именно по всему по этому о сексе говорится не как о естественной и нормальной потребности, а как о каком-то грязно-запретном удовольствии.

Mark: Efforts are being made in the U.S. to use modern medicine and technological advances to make it possible for the physically handicapped to take a greater part in society. This includes close-captioned TV programs for the hearing-impaired, wheelchair ramps in public places, "kneeling" buses, and a general effort to educate the public to the problems of the handicapped. Laws have been passed that require local public schools to educate the handicapped. Federal grants are available to develop programming for children's public TV that features the physically and mentally handicapped in the hope that children will become more sensitive to other children with handicaps.

Николай: Я вижу, Марк, вам нравится медицинская тема, а я, признаюсь, сам говорю уж что-то очень много. Ладно, буду кратким. Государство выделяет довольно значительные средства на инвалидов, но в то же время имеется четкая тенденция: ни дебилы, ни инвалиды (даже инвалиды войны), не предназначены для показа, они должны быть скрыты от глаз людей. Люди при социализме, Марк, все здоровые, веселые и радостные. Кстати, Марк, я совершенно потрясен вашим рассказом о том, что на Западе душевнобольного человека нельзя против его воли поместить в психиатрическую больницу. Помните, вы мне говорили, что для госпитализации такого больного необходимо не только свидетельство двух независимых друг от друга психиатров, но и решение суда. Однако и этого недостаточно для того, чтобы заставить больного принимать лекарства. Лишь специальная Комиссия, состоящая из представителей медицинских и судебных учреждений, может принять такое решение. Ну и ну! У нас всё это гораздо проще. Мнение двух психиатров полностью определяет судьбу больного. Поэтому у нас и здорового могут запереть в сумасшедший дом в одну минуту, если, конечно, это нужно кое-каким известным органам.

Quiz

На основе информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое положение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

________________ а. Медицинское обслуживание в Советском Союзе платное.

________________ б. Пациенты советских больниц очень непритязательные люди.

________________ в. В СССР анестезия применяется чаще, чем в США.

________________ г. В Советском Союзе гомосексуализм является тяжёлым уголовным преступлением.

________________ д. В СССР нельзя поместить душевнобольного человека в больницу против его воли.

TRANSLATION OF RUSSIAN PORTION OF LESSON ON MEDICINE

Nikolai: Medical care is free in the USSR, as everyone knows. Is this good or bad? I think it is hard to answer this question simply. On the one hand, it is, of course, good. It is good to know that in case of illness you will be treated without having to pay a cent. It is good to know that the doctor doesn't make money on your misfortune. It is good not to have put away money for a medical emergency. This is the positive side of free medicine. On the other hand, free medical care is usually accompanied by low-quality service, indifference to patients, the necessity of bribing health-care providers, and the building of special clinics for the privileged. I think that it is an exaggeration to say that Soviet medicine is entirely free. Moreover, I think that the pride many Soviets take in free medicine--"look at our medicine, it is free, humane, populist, and progressive"--is not entirely justified. Free medicine is

provided because of the very significant underpayment of salaries to both doctors and patients (since the state is everyone's employer).

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I think that Soviet medical services can't begin to compare with American services. In hospitals, for instance, linen is changed only once a week. One toilet must serve twenty or even thirty. Private phones are totally out of the question, and the equipment in the majority of our hospitals is outdated. If we are to approach the differences from the perspective of differences in mentality, however, what surprises us is the fact that the patient is so accepting and seemingly indifferent to creature comforts. An American patient under the same conditions would be highly critical.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: Yes, our dentists don't give novocaine for certain painful procedures. It is hard to explain why. Some say it is because of the expense of anesthetics, while others contend that certain procedures, such as root canal work, are better accomplished if the patient can sense the pain. I believe that the traditional attitude towards pain as something that needs to be tolerated and a certain scorn for comfort are also significant. The lack of anesthetics during childbirth and abortion is nationwide.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I think, Mark, that sex education is still practically nonexistent in the USSR and this, of course, influences attitudes towards this subject. Sex-related quesitions are not discussed openly. It is as if they didn't exist at all. Homosexuality is a dangerous crime, and books on sexuality cannot be found anywhere. For this reason sex is discussed not as a natural and normal need but as a forbidden, dirty activity.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I see, Mark, that you like this subject. I, too, have gone on too long. Well, I'll be brief. The state spends considerable funds on invalids and the mentally ill, but at the same time there is a definite tendency to hide the handicapped and invalids, even handicapped veterans, as well as the mentally ill from view. Under socialism, Mark, everyone must be healthy and happy. By the way, Mark, I am shocked by what you say about laws that forbid placing mentally ill individuals in hospitals against their will. Do you remember telling me that to hospitalize a mentally ill individual it is not only necessary to have certificates from 2 independent psychiatrists but also a court order? Even this is insufficient for forcing the patient to take medicine. Only a special commission consisting of doctors and lawyers can make such a decision. Well, well, things are a lot easier here with respect to that. The opinion of 2 psychiatrists can decide the fate of the mentally ill person. For this reason, even a person who is well can be placed in an institution for the mentally ill if this is deemed necessary by certain organizations.

12.
О терминологии
(Terminology)

Марк: Мне кажется, Николай, что и в СССР и в США существует одинаковая политическая терминология, но смысл ее различный. Не так ли?

Николай: Не возражаю. Возьми, например, понятие «член партии». Для американца член партии—это просто позиция при голосовании. По твоим словам, член партии в Америке не подчинен никакой партийной дисциплине. В СССР член партии обязан находиться в той или иной конкретной партийной организации, выполнять все решения партии, помогать партии своими денежными взносами. Более того, быть членом партии в СССР—это делать карьеру, продвигаться по службе, повышать свое благополучие. В США, если все это и имеет место, то только на высшем уровне партийного чиновничества. Да что там «член партии»! Можно, например, взять и что-нибудь попроще. Подумай, например, над словом «граница». Я помню, один мой приятель, эмигрировавший в США, написал мне от том, как он пересёк границу между США и Канадой. У него практически не было никаких документов, а пограничник спросил только, к кому он едет и с какой целью. Мой приятель был совершенно потрясен такой пограничной процедурой. И недаром. Для советских людей граница—это нечто святое и таинственное и в то же время это—закрытая, запрещенная полоса, это мертвая зона. Не только сама граница, но и близлежащая территория находится под неусыпным контролем и постоянным надзором. Без документов и специального разрешения ни одно живое существо перейти границу не может. Ни туда, ни обратно. Граница—это защита от внешнего враждебного мира, границу надо укреплять и охранять, границе надо верно служить, а перешедших границу надо уничтожать без всяких колебаний.

Или возьми понятие закона. У нас говорят: закон—что дышло, куда повернешь, туда и вышло. Никому, например, даже в голову не приходит, что государственная власть ответственна перед законом. Наоборот, для всех естественно, что закон—это оружие этой власти в ее борьбе с населением, причем независимо от того, как закон сформулирован.

Quiz

На основе информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое положение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

____________________ а. В СССР член партии не подчинён никакой партийной дисциплине.

____________________ б. Граница между США и Канадой закрыта.

____________________ в. Ни один человек не может пересечь границу СССР без специального разрешения.

____________________ г. В США исполнительная власть ответственна перед законом.

____________________ д. Политбюро ЦК КПСС ответственно перед законами СССР.

Резюме на английском языке--On Terminology

The dialogue begins as an American observes that it seems to him that, in the USSR and the U.S., the political terminology is identical, but the meaning is different.

The Soviet citizen agrees. Take for example the meaning of the term "party member." For Americans, the term "party member" simply refers to one's voting preferences. In the U.S., a member of a political party is not subject to any party discipline. In the USSR, a party member is a person who must belong to one party organization or another which fulfills all decisions of the party and helps the party through the payment of dues. At the same time, in the sphere of voting, party membership has no meaning, for voting itself is *pro forma*. In addition, to be a party member is to make a career for oneself, to advance through service, and to increase one's material well-being. In the U.S., if these things also have their place, it is only at the higher levels of the party heirarchy.

The Soviet citizen then discusses the word "border." S/he recalls that an acquaintance who had emigrated to the U.S. wrote about crossing the border between the U.S. and Canada. The traveler had almost no documents, and the border guard asked only whom he would be visiting and what would be the purpose of his trip. The acquaintance had been completely astounded by this border procedure. And no wonder. For Soviets, the border is something sacred and secret, at one and the same time closed, a forbidden place, a zone of death. Not only the border itself but also the territory in close proximity to it is under unrelenting control and constant surveillance. Without documents and special permission, not one living thing can cross the border--in either direction. The border is a defense against the external, hostile world; it must be strengthened and protected. It is necessary to serve faithfully on the borders, and those violating the border must be destroyed, without any hesitation.

Or take the meaning of law. In the USSR, it is said that the law is a beam--the way you turn it is the way it comes out. It would occur to no one, for instance, that the central government authorities are responsible before the law, and that the law can be applied to high executives and party organizations. On the contrary, it seems natural to everyone that the law is a weapon of these authorities in their struggle with the people, notwithstanding the way the law may be formulated.

13.
О чтении советской прессы
(Reading Soviet Newspapers)

Марк: Николай, я часто слышу от русских, что газету надо читать между строк. Для нас, американцев, это очень необычно. Не ознакомишь ли ты меня с техникой такого чтения?

Николай: Что ж, дай-ка подумать. Значит так. Прежде всего—везде ищи намек. Чтение советской прессы—это умение разбираться в символике намека. Вот смотри. Это, кажется, «Правда». А ну-ка, перекинь мне ее сюда на минутку. Так . . . Ага, вот статья о Польше. В ней говорится, что задачи партийных организаций по усилению роли рабочего класса в обществе, дальнейшему укреплению связей партии с широкими массами трудящихся были обсуждены на состоявшемся здесь заседании Политбюро ЦК ПОРП. Для советского читателя отсюда вывод: в Польше проблемы с рабочими, рабочий класс недостаточно поддерживает партию, массы тоже недовольны правящей верхушкой». Однако это довольно прямой намек. Есть более сложная символика. К примеру, председателем комиссии по похоронам Брежнева был назначен Андропов. Для опытного читателя газет было ясно, что Андропов будет его преемником.

Затем внимательно смотри на критические статьи или на критические замечания в статьях. Очень часто под критикой той или иной личности подразумевается критика целого направления в политике, науке или искусстве, а за критикой направления часто скрывается междуусобная борьба за власть.

Также будь внимателен к тому, что замалчивается, Если, к примеру, ты не видишь имени члена Политбюро в очередном отчете об очередном заседании, это, возможно, признак того, что он уже в опале. Если нет сообщения о ходе военных действий в определенном районе земного шара—смело предполагай, что этот ход не устраивает Советский Союз. Если в подписях под некрологом какого-нибудь высокопоставленного чиновника нет имени Главного Вождя, делай вывод: вождь был покойником недоволен.

Умей находить в газете маленькие и незаметные сообщения. Они подчас важнее больших и громоздких статей. Именно из них ты можешь узнать, когда умер Хрущев, где разбился самолет, кому проиграл Карпов, отчего не состоялся космический полет, в каком районе эпидемия холеры и т.д.

Quiz

На основе информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое положение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

__________________ а. Для американцев важно уметь читать свои газеты между строк.

__________________ б. Читатели в СССР хорошо разбираются в символике намёков, характерных для советской прессы.

__________________ в. Председателем комиссии по похоронам Брежнева был назначен Горбачёв.

__________________ г. В советской печати вы никогда не встретите критических статей.

__________________ д. Маленькие и незаметные сообщения в советских газетах подчас важнее больших и громоздких статей.

Резюме на английском языке--On Reading Soviet Newspapers

The foreigner notes that s/he has often heard from Russians that one must read between the lines of the newspaper. S/he asks a Soviet friend to explain this technique of reading.

The Russian replies, "Let's think it over." First of all, one must look everywhere for hints. Reading the Soviet press necessitates using the ability to analyze the symbolism of hints. Take a look at *Pravda*, for example. Here is an article about Poland. It says that the task of party organizations is strengthening the role of the working class in society, and the further strengthening of ties between the party and the masses were discussed at a meeting held here of the Politburo of the PUWP (Polish United Worker's Party). The Soviet reader concludes that Poland is experiencing problems with its workers, that the working class does not support the party sufficiently, and that the masses are unhappy with the ruling circle. However, this is a rather straightforward hint. There is more complicated symbolism. For example, Andropov was designated the chairman of Brezhnev's funeral commission. For the experienced newspaper reader, it was clear that Andropov would be his successor.

In addition, pay particular attention to critical articles or critical observations in articles. Very often criticism of an individual implies criticism of an entire line of policy in science or the arts, and behind criticism of a line of policy is hidden an internecine struggle for power.

Also pay attention to what is not said. If, for example, you don't see the name of a member of the Politburo in the list of participants at a meeting, this is a possible sign that s/he is already in disgrace. If there is no announcement of the outcome of military operations in a particular area of the globe, you can confidently assume that the outcome did not favor the Soviet Union. If, in the obituary of a highly placed person, the leader's name does not appear, make this conclusion: the leader was not satisfied with him or her.

One can quickly find small and barely noticeable announcements in the newspaper. These are sometimes more important than larger and more bulky articles. Indeed, from these you may discover when Khruschev died, where a plane crashed, why Karpov lost, why a space flight did not take place, in which area there was an epidemic of cholera, and so on.

14.

Отношение к власти
(Attitudes toward the Government)

Марк: Николай, как вы, русские, относитесь к государственной власти, к политике, как вы воспринимаете все это?

Николай: Это довольно сложный вопрос, Марк. Более того, это спорный вопрос. Поэтому, боюсь, мне трудно будет высказать мнение, с которым все русские были бы согласны. Однако я постараюсь найти несколько наиболее типичных положений. Во-первых, мы воспринимаем власть как нечто не зависящее от нас. Для нас власть—это некая внешняя сила, которую мы не можем изменить и к которой мы вынуждены приспосабливаться. Во-вторых, наше отношение к власти мы можем выразить и еще одним словом-лицемерие. Мы постоянно говорим одно, а думаем другое.

Марк: Чем вызвано это лицемерие?

Николай: Я думаю, прежде всего—страхом, нежеланием иметь неприятности. Затем, как мне кажется, разницей между формальным и реальным содержанием политической жизни в СССР. Так, формально политическая власть в России обладает всеми атрибутами демократии и внешне мы видим четкое разделение законодательной, юридической и исполнительной власти. В СССР есть Верховный Совет, представляющий законодательную власть, Верховный Суд—юридическую и Совет Министров—исполнительную, однако на самом деле все это бутафория, поскольку реальная власть принадлежит Политбюро ЦК КПСС. Я хочу сказать, что формальное соблюдение некоторых норм демократии (в СССР есть и местные органы власти, и даже выборы проводятся, и народные заседатели в судах присутствуют) облегчает эту игру в лицемерие, создает почву, при которой это лицемерие (конечно, под давлением властей) может существовать.

Марк: Николай, а есть люди в СССР, которые верят в то, что говорят?

Николай: Ты хочешь сказать, есть ли сейчас в СССР люди, которые не лицемерят, а искренне верят в советскую политическую систему, в социализм. Есть, но их всё меньше и меньше. Я думаю, что вера в социализм исчезает на глазах и поэтому никаких моральных оправданий для этого лицемерия не существует.

Quiz

На основе информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое положение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

_______________ а. Когда русские говорят о политике, они всегда говорят то, что думают.

_______________ б. Николай считает, что органы власти в СССР полностью отражают общественное мнение.

_______________ в. Формально политическая власть в СССР обладает всеми атрибутами демократии.

_______________ г. Совет Министров СССР представляет судебную власть.

_______________ д. Советские люди никогда не верили в социализм.

Резюме на английском языке--Feelings toward the Government

The conversation takes place between a Soviet citizen and a foreigner. The foreigner is trying to determine how Soviet citizens feel about their government and its policies.

In reply, the Soviet citizen notes that this is a complex and controversial question--one that is difficult to respond to in a way acceptable to all Russians. However, the Soviet citizen will try to make a few general comments. In the first place, Soviet citizens see their government as independent of them--virtually a foreign power which they cannot change or control. Moreover, Soviet citizens cannot state their true feelings about their government and are constantly forced to engage in hypocrisy.

The foreigner asks what causes Soviet citizens to engage in this hypocrisy. The Soviet replies that the first reason is fear--the desire to avoid any "unpleasantness" with the authorities. In addition, it is important to understand the form and reality of political life in the Soviet Union. Formally, political power in the Soviet Union has all the attributes of democracy. The Soviet Union has a Supreme Soviet, supposedly the seat of legislative power; a Supreme Court, the seat of judicial power; and a Council of Ministers, the seat of executive power. However, in reality, all this is window-dressing, since real power belongs only to the Politburo. The formal observance of democratic norms (in the USSR there are local power organizations, elections, and even popular participation in judicial proceedings) facilitates this hypocrisy--under pressure from the authorities, of course.

The foreigner asks whether there are not people in the USSR who believe what they are told. The Soviet citizen replies that there were such people; even Solzhenitsyn was once a believer in socialism. In general, the illusion existing in the USSR of common ownership of property has played a colossal role in the development of Soviet life. From the Soviet citizen's point of view, this illusion nourished the political hypocrisy they have been discussing for a long time. However, today there are no illusions in the USSR. Belief in socialism is gone, and there is no longer any moral justification for such hypocrisy.

15.

О внешнеполитических отношениях

(Foreign Relations)

Марк: Николай, существуют ли какие-нибудь ментальные различия, которые влияют на внешнеполитические отношения между СССР и США?

Николай: В принципе, я не знаю, можно ли эти различия называть ментальными, но то, что они есть, в этом нет сомнения. Я бы скорее назвал их разными подходами к решению внешнеполитических проблем. На первое место я бы поставил вот что: если советские в своих внешнеполитических отношениях защищают всегда только интересы государственно-партийного аппарата, то американцы частенько вынуждены отражать чаяния и тех кругов, интересы которых не совпадают с интересами правительства. Возьми, к примеру, проблему зерна. Американские президенты не раз пытались остановить поставки зерна Советскому Союзу, чтобы наказать его за агрессивную политику, однако под давлением фермеров, заинтересованных в этих поставках, все американские президенты как по команде отступали от своих же позиций и возобновляли продажу зерна СССР.

В этой связи следует подчеркнуть и тот факт, что советская внешняя политика меньше всего подвергается всякого рода гуманным, моральным влияниям. Что творилось в США, когда во Вьетнаме погибали молодые американские парни! И списки погибших публиковались, и интервью у их родителей брались, и демонстрации протеста устраивались, и петиции подписывались, и чего только не делали американские сторонники мира, чтобы прекратить войну! А кто знает, сколько советских солдат погибло в Афганистане, кто слышал хоть одно слово протеста, кто видел хоть одну мать, рыдающую над гробом сына?

Затем, с моей точки зрения, неплохо было бы отметить разницу во влиянии личности руководителя на внешнюю политику. В США внешняя политика менее однообразна, менее стабильна, поскольку очень часто она проводится разными лицами. В СССР же мы имеем дело с одним и тем же лицом в течение многих лет. Сколько госсекретарей поменялось в США за эти годы, а Громыко был министром иностранных дел более 30 лет. К тому же лица, проводящие внешнюю политику США, в своих действиях и поступках более свободны от той социально-политической системы, которую они представляют. Это очень важно, по-моему, понимать, так как американцы склонны оценивать деятельность советских руководителей с точки зрения своих собственных представлений о роли личности. Так, они думают, что если к власти пришел новый генсек, например, Горбачёв, то политика СССР может принципиально измениться. На самом же деле Горбачёв может делать только то, что требует от него тоталитарная система. Горбачёв никогда не пойдет на такое разоружение, которое хоть в какой-нибудь мере ослабит советское военное превосходство, и он, конечно, никогда до конца не уступит гуманитарным требованиям западных стран, поскольку они просто опасны для существования Горбачёва и его класса.

Quiz

На основе информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое положение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

__________________ а. Между СССР и США существует полное взаимопонимание в области внешнеполитических отношений.

__________________ б. Американская внешняя политика отражает интересы всех групп американского общества.

__________________ в. Очень часто американская внешняя политика находится под влиянием гуманных или моральных соображений.

__________________ г. А. Громыко был министром иностранных дел более сорока лет.

__________________ д. Михаил Горбачёв может делать только то, что позволяет ему тоталитарная система.

Резюме на английском языке--On International Relations

The American begins by saying: If we take international political relations between the two countries, can we assume that some of their views of each other are the result of, so to speak, perceptual differences?

The Russian replies: In principle, I don't know whether these differences can be called perceptual--but there is no doubt of their existence. I would more readily call them different approaches to the solution of foreign policy problems. In the first place, I would suggest that, if the Soviets in their foreign policy defend only the interests of the government-party apparatus, then the Americans often find it necessary to reflect the desires of groups whose interests do not coincide with the interests of the government. Take for example the problem of grain. American presidents have attempted more than once to halt delivery of grain to the Soviet Union, in order to punish it for aggressive policies. However, under the pressure of farmers interested in those deliveries, all American presidents, as if on command, have moved away from their positions and resumed the sale of grain to the USSR.

In this connection, it is appropriate to emphasize the fact that Soviet foreign policy is least of all susceptible to various types of humanitarian or moral influence. While young Americans were dying in Vietnam, lists of their names were published in the U.S. Their parents were interviewed, protest demonstrations were organized, petitions were signed, and virtually everything was done by American supporters of peace to end the war. Who knows how many Soviets have died in Afghanistan, but who has heard even one word of protest or seen even one mother sobbing over the grave of her son?

In addition, from my point of view, it wouldn't be bad to point out the effect of differences in the personalities of leaders on foreign policy. In the U.S., foreign policy is less coherent and stable because its leaders change often. In the USSR, individuals remain leaders for many years. How many Secretaries of State have come and gone in the U.S. in recent years, while Gromyko has been Minister of Foreign Affairs for more than 30 years? In addition, the individuals conducting foreign policy in the U.S. have more freedom of action. In my opinion, this is very important, since Americans are inclined to evaluate the actions of Soviet leaders from their perception of the role of personality in government. In this way, Americans thought that if a new General Secretary came to power, for example Gorbachev, Soviet policy might change fundamentally. In reality, Gorbachev can do only that which is demanded of him by the totalitarian system. He will never agree to disarmament which would weaken Soviet military superiority to any degree. Of course, he will never agree to the human rights demands of Western countries, because acquiescing to such demands would be dangerous to Andropov and his class.

16.
Пропаганда
(Propaganda)

Марк: Как-то мы разговорились с Николаем о трагическом происшествии с корейским пассажирским самолетом, сбитым советским летчиком. Я был потрясен беспрецедентной наглостью советской прессы, которая без стыда и совести дезинформировала население СССР. Особенно меня поразил тот факт, что официальная пропаганда, вначале отрицавшая (около шести дней!) нападение на гражданский лайнер, затем спокойно и хладнокровно признала зверское уничтожение 269 неповинных людей. Потом разговор постепенно перешел на пропаганду вообще, на ее приемы, на разницу между пропагандой в США и в СССР. Вот тогда-то, помню, Николай высказал несколько интересных мыслей, которые я цитирую по памяти, поскольку эта беседа проходила на улице и не записывалась.

Николай: Знаешь, Марк, я думаю, что в Америке просто нет пропаганды в советском смысле этого слова. Почему? Ведь что такое пропаганда в СССР? Это выражение той или иной позиции (идеологической, политической, социальной, экономической, информационной и т.д.), которая не подлежит никакой критике ни с чьей стороны. Это и порождает пропагандистские приемы, удивляющие людей свободного мира. Какие приемы? Гм! Я бы их сформулировал так: бешеная атака, кривая логика, скрытая угроза. Действительно, советская пропаганда, Марк, никогда не защищается, никогда не отступает, никогда не оправдывается, она, наоборот, всегда идет вперед, всегда наступает, всегда активно и агрессивно осуждает противника. Тон советской пропаганды категоричен, окончателен и не подлежит никакому сомнению. Весь мир был буквально вне себя от возмущения, когда Советский Союз уничтожил мирный пассажирский самолет, но этот же мир был совершенно огорошен тем, что советская пропаганда смело бросилась обвинять в этой трагедии американского президента и его разведку. Атакующий стиль советской пропаганды доходит до апофеоза, когда она переносит все с больной головы на здоровую, когда она обвиняет противника именно в том, в чем ее обвиняет противник.

Далее. Советская пропаганда, несмотря на то, что она несет несусветную ложь и чепуху, всегда тщательно обдумана и подчас оснащена великолепным логическим аппаратом. Поскольку этот аппарат, эта логика служат лжи, а не истине, постольку я и называю ее кривой логикой. Так, в случае с самолетом коммунистическая пресса умело использовала следующие доводы: 1) в момент происшествия в воздухе на той же высоте находился другой, похожий на пассажирский лайнер, самолет-разведчик военно-воздушных сил США «РС-135»; 2) самолет-нарушитель вошел в воздушное пространство над Камчаткой в районе, где размещена важнейшая база стратегических ядерных сил СССР; 3) самолет не отвечал ни на какие предупредительные сигналы и не подчинился требованию лететь на советский аэродром; 4) советским летчикам не было известно, что это гражданский самолет, поскольку он шел без аэронавигационных огней, глубокой ночью, в условиях плохой видимости; 5) через территорию Советского Союза проходят десятки международных авиалиний и ничего с иностранными самолетами не происходит, если они соблюдают установленные правила; 6) объективно гибель самолета очень выгодна Рейгану и поможет ему заставить Конгресс проголосовать за увеличение военных ассигнований; 7) не Рейгану лить слезы о «ценности человеческих жизней», не ему говорить о морали и человечности, ибо это США лишили жизней миллионы людей в Индокитае. Все эти доводы искусно вписаны в общий текст заявления или обращения, грамотно и последовательно расставлены, умело соединены со всякого рода интонациями, рассчитанными на эмоциональность читателя. И все это для того, чтобы скрыть правду и обвинить не себя, а Соединенные Штаты; для того, чтобы упрятать, замазать простейшую истину: гражданский пассажирский самолет сбит советским военным летчиком и Советский Союз должен нести за это полную моральную и материальную ответственность.

Наконец, всякая пропаганда в СССР, особенно связанная с внешнеполитическими вопросами, всегда проникнута эдакой наглостью безнаказанного хулигана, всегда несет в себе скрытую мрачную угрозу сильного, знающего своё превосходство бандита. Чаще всего такая угроза спрятана под тем или иным эвфемизмом: «мы и дальше будем действовать в соответствии с нашими законами»—читай: «мы и дальше будем убивать невинных людей». Цель таких угроз всегда одна: продемонстрировать Западу, что СССР сильнее, что СССР наплевать на Запад и его мораль, что СССР никогда не уступит Западу. С точки зрения советской пропаганды это убивает сразу двух зайцев: и Западу показывает, что в жизни главное не разговорчики, а сила, мощь, и собственному народу дает понять что к чему.

Quiz

На основе информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое положение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

__________________ а. Советская пропаганда всегда оправдывается.

__________________ б. Любимый приём советской пропаганды—переносить всё с больной головы на здоровую.

__________________ в. Советским Союзом был сбит самолёт-разведчик Военно-Воздушных Сил США «РС-135».

__________________ г. Через территорию Советского Союза проходят десятки международных авиалиний.

__________________ д. Советская пропаганда не рассчитана на эмоциональность читателя.

Резюме на английском языке--On Propaganda

The American (Mark) begins by saying that he had somehow entered into a conversation with his Russian friend Nikolai about the tragic case of the Korean passenger aircraft shot down by a Soviet pilot. In connection with this, Mark expressed his surprise at the unparalleled impudence of the Soviet press, which shamelessly and dishonestly deceived the Soviet people. In particular, Mark was struck by the fact that official propaganda at the beginning denied the attack on the civilian airliner for almost six days, and then calmly and cold-bloodedly acknowledged the brutal destruction of 269 innocent people.

At this point, the conversation moved step-by-step on to the propaganda struggle, its features, and the difference between U.S. propaganda and that of the USSR. Then Mark recalled that Nikolai had expressed an interesting thought which he quotes from memory, because the conversation took place in the street and Mark didn't write it down.

Nikolai said, "You know, Mark, I think that in America there is simply no propaganda in the Soviet meaning of the word. Why? What sort of propaganda exists in the USSR? It is an expression of one position or another (ideological, political, social, economic, informational, etc.) which is not subject to any criticism from any side. This fosters propaganda methods, which surprises people of the free world. What methods? I would characterize them this way: furious attack, crooked logic, hidden threats. In reality, Soviet propaganda never defends itself, never retreats, never justifies itself. On the contrary, it always actively and aggressively condemns the adversary. The tone of Soviet propaganda is categorical, definitive, and permits no doubt. The whole world was filled with revulsion when the Soviet Union destroyed a peaceful passenger plane. But the same world was completely taken aback that Soviet propaganda boldly put the blame for this tragedy not on itself, but on the American President and his intelligence service. The attacking style of Soviet propaganda approaches its apotheosis when it accuses its adversary of exactly that of which it has been itself accused, i.e., when it carries over everything from a sick mind to a healthy one."

Further, Soviet propaganda--notwithstanding the fact that it carries absurd lies and nonsense--is always carefully thought out and at times is based on a splendid logical apparatus. Because this apparatus, this logic, consists of lies, and not truth, Nikolai calls it crooked logic. In the case of the Korean aircraft, the communist press confidently used the following arguments: 1) at the time of the event, there was another plane resembling the passenger liner in the same vicinity, a U.S. Air Force intelligence aircraft, RC-135; 2) the aircraft had entered Soviet air space over Kamchatka, where the USSR has one of its most important bases of the strategic nuclear forces; 3) the aircraft did not respond to any warning signals and did not obey the demand to follow an escort or to proceed to a Soviet airport; 4) the Soviet pilot did not know that it was a civilian aircraft, because it was flying without aviation lights on a dark night, in conditions of poor visibility; 5) dozens of international airlines traverse Soviet territory and nothing happens to foreign aircraft if they observe established procedures; 6) objectively, the destruction of the aircraft was useful to Reagan in forcing Congress to vote in favor of an increase in military spending; 7) Reagan should not cry over the value of human life, or speak of morality and humaneness when the U.S. itself took the lives of millions of people in Vietnam. All of these arguments were artfully written in the general text of announcements or addresses, expertly and consistently distributed, skillfully combined with various types of intonation, calculated to influence the Soviet reader's emotions. And all this was done in order to cover up the shameful truth: a civilian passenger aircraft was shot down by a Soviet military pilot, and the Soviet Union must bear the full moral and material responsibility.

Finally, Soviet propaganda, in particular propaganda on international political questions, is always inspired with the impudence of an unpunished hooligan, always carrying a veiled threat of force with a bandit's confident air. Most of the time, such a threat is hidden behind some euphemism. "We will act in accordance with our laws" should be read as, "we will destroy disobedient people." The objective of such threats is always the same: to demonstrate to the West that the USSR is powerful, that the USSR is superior to the West and its morals, that the USSR never accommodates to the West. From this point of view, Soviet propaganda kills two birds with one stone. It shows the West that in life the most important thing is not talk, but force and power; and it makes clear to its own people that the same threats apply to them.

51

17.
О газетах, книгах и поэзии
(Newspapers, Books, Poetry)

Марк: Николай, я много думал о тех особых проявлениях русской или, скажем, советской культуры, которые могли бы удивить американца в Советском Союзе. Причем я говорю не о всякого рода бросающихся в глаза мелочах.

Николай: Что ты имеешь в виду под мелочами?

Марк: Всякую всячину. К примеру, газетные стенды на улицах советских городов. У нас в Америке просто невозможно повесить всю газету на стенд, потому что объем одной серьезной американской газеты может равняться годовой подписке «Правды». Помимо этого, до американцев просто не доходит, что все советские газеты выражают только одну единственную точку зрения правительственную. И это понятно: в Америке нет ни одной правительственной газеты. Или другой пример: книжный черный рынок. Американцу трудно представить, что книга может быть дефицитным товаром. Ведь если книга пользуется успехом, она тут же будет переиздана. Запрета же на публикацию различных идеологических концепций в Америке просто не существует, что делает невозможным бешеный спрос на такого рода литературу. Удивляет американца и тысяча других мелочей: относительно низкие цены на книги, невозможность достать литературу, издающуюся за рубежом, дешевизна билетов в кино, платный вход в государственные музеи и галереи, плохое качество рекламы и т.д. Однако опять-таки мне бы хотелось говорить о более глубоких различиях. Так, американцев всегда поражает, с каким обостренным вниманием относятся граждане СССР к своим поэтам и бардам, как ищут в их строках политические намеки, как долго хранят о них память. Что ты скажешь по этому поводу?

Николай: Что я скажу? Думаю, что ты совершенно прав. Традиционно поэт в России—это пророк, выразитель общественного мнения, борец за справедливость. У нас популярность поэта определяется не только его талантом (талант, конечно, обязателен), не только его способностью отражать чаяния людей (иначе он вообще не поэт), но и его гражданской смелостью, его неприятием недостатков существующего политического режима. Но режим не позволяет поэту «бунтовать», а настоящий поэт не «бунтовать» не может. Вот и получается, что тот поэт более популярен, кто с помощью различных намеков все-таки критикует режим, все-таки доносит до читателя или слушателя свое свободомыслие. Тебе знакомо, я уверен, имя Высоцкого. Пожалуй, нет в Союзе сейчас поэта более известного. До сих пор тысячи людей приходят на его могилу, миллионы людей слушают с восхищением его песни, хотя практически его песни не публиковались. Конечно же, нельзя спорить или отрицать, что талант Высоцкого, народность его творчества—главные источники его славы. Но дело не только в этом. Высоцкий, как никто другой, смог выразить недовольство людей существующей системой, как никто другой, смог показать ее антигуманный характер. И получалось это у него совершенно уникально, в только ему присущей манере, через ряд художественных образов—намеков. Ты слышал, Марк, «Коней» Высоцкого?

Марк: О, да. По-моему, это одна из лучших его вещей.

Николай: Помнишь? «Вдоль обрыва, по-над пропастью, по самому по краю, я коней своих нагайкою стегаю, погоняю, что-то воздуха мне мало, ветер пью, туман глотаю, чую с гибельным восторгом—пропадаю, пропадаю!» Кажется, что особенного говорят эти слова непосвященному человеку? Картина, конечно, захватывающая: пропасть, кони несут поэта «по самому по краю», еще секунда, еще мгновение—и его ждет смерть. Но где здесь протест, где здесь политика, где здесь критика режима? В том-то и дело, что она вся здесь как на ладони, что на русского, привыкшего читать намеки не умом, а сердцем, эта картина обрушивает лавину антисоветских чувствований и аналогий. Ясно, что кони- это олицетворение музы поэта и что его муза находится все время на острие бритвы, на лезвии ножа, в мгновении от опасности или гибели. Но разве не в таком положении находятся миллионы людей в СССР? Разве не они ходят постоянно по краю пропасти? Разве не для них сказать правду, выразить свое искреннее мнение равносильно падению в пропасть, гибели, попаданию в немилость, потере работы, преследованию со стороны властей? Отсюда и возникает такая необыкновенная и непонятная для американца любовь к Высоцкому, такая удивительная тяга и преклонение. Высоцкий талантливо и смело пропел то, что пока еще боится сказать весь русский народ, но что он, конечно, рано или поздно скажет.

Quiz

На основе информации, полученной из текста, определите, какое положение «правильно», а какое «неправильно».

__________________ а. В СССР очень легко достать литературу, опубликованную за рубежом.

__________________ б. В США нет ни одной правительственной газеты.

__________________ в. Все газеты в СССР выражают только одну точку зрения—правительственную.

__________________ г. Роль поэта в СССР и США одинакова.

__________________ д. Владимир Высоцкий—известный советский диссидент.

TRANSLATION OF RUSSIAN PORTION OF LESSON ON NEWSPAPERS, BOOKS, AND POETRY

Mark: "Nikolai, I have given quite a bit of thought to examples of Russian, or let's say Soviet, culture which would surprise an American in the Soviet Union. Here I don't mean various details but rather..."

Nikolai: "What do you mean by details?"

Mark: "Oh, all sorts of things. For instance, those newspaper displays which one finds on the streets of Soviet cities. In America, it would be simply impossible to hang an entire newspaper on one of those because one major American newpaper is equal in volume to a year's subscription to *Pravda*. Another thing is that Americans simply cannot understand that Soviet newspapers express only one point of view--the government's. This is

understandable, since in America there isn't a single government-run newspaper. Another example is the black market in books. It is difficult for Americans to imagine that a book could be a deficit item, since all popular books are immediately reprinted and there are no bans on expressing various ideological positions. This, in turn, makes it much more difficult for a book to create the kind of stir that it can in the Soviet Union when it expresses a forbidden ideology."

"Many other details are surprising--the relatively low cost of books, the fact that it is impossible to get books published abroad, the shockingly low price of movie tickets, admission charges to state museums and galleries, the poor quality of advertisement, etc. However, I would rather talk about deeper differences."

"Americans are surprised by the heightened interest that Soviet citizens display toward the work of their poets and bards, seeking out lines holding meaning and hints comprehensible to them alone and keeping them alive in their memories. What would you say about this?"

Nikolai: "What would I say? I think that you are right. Traditionally, the poet in Russia has been a prophet, the person who expresses public opinion, the fighter for justice. For us, a poet's popularity is determined not only by talent (though the talent of course has to be there), but by his or her ability to reflect the hopes of the people (otherwise s/he is not a poet at all), and by her/his bravery as a citizen and unwillingness to accept the faults of the existing political regime. The regime does not allow the poet to be a mutineer, yet a real poet cannot help but be one. For this reason, the most popular poet is one who, through a system of various hints, still manages to criticize the regime and express thoughts freely. I am sure that you are familiar with the name of Vyssotsky. There is perhaps no better-known poet in the USSR. Thousands of people continue to visit his grave, millions listen enraptured to his songs, although his songs were practically never published or advertised. It is impossible to argue or deny that Vyssotsky's talent and the folk universality of his songs are responsible for his popularity. There is more to it than that, however. Vyssotsky was able, better than anyone else, to express the discontent of the people with the existing system and to depict its inhumaneness. He was able to do this in a totally unique manner, characteristic of his work alone, through literary images and hints. Mark, have you heard his song "The Horses?"

Mark: "Oh yes, I think that it is one of his best."

Nikolai: "Remember 'Along the edge of the precipice over the abyss I urge my horses on with a whip. I lash them. There isn't enough air for me, I drink the wind and swallow the mist and feel with fatal rapture that I perish, I perish'? One would think that these words say nothing to the uninitiated. The scene is of course an exciting one, horses carrying the poet along the very edge, one more second, one more instant, and death awaits. Where is the protest here, where are the politics and criticism of the regime? That is just the point, that for Russians who are used to reading hints, not with their minds but with their hearts, the scene crashes down on them like an avalanche of anti-Soviet feelings and analogies. It is clear that the horses are a personification of the poet's muse and that the muse is always on the razor's edge, a second away from danger or peril. Aren't millions of people in the USSR in the same position? Don't they constantly walk along the edge of an abyss? Isn't expressing one's true opinion, and telling the truth, equal to falling into the abyss? Isn't perishing equal to falling into disfavor, losing one's job, and being persecuted by the authorities? Hence the singular love for Vyssotsky, incomprehensible to Americans, and the great admiration and gravitation towards him. Vyssotsky ably and bravely sang out that which the Russian people are still afraid to say.

18.

Контрольный урок

(Quiz)

Part I Read the English quiz and discuss the answers with you teacher.

Part II Then read the Russian quiz and try to translate it or simply make sure that you understand all the dialogues. The dialogues are written in colloquial and conversational Russian. For this reason, you may find them quite difficult to understand. They have been selected primarily because of the differences they illustrate in the two societies and cultures. They are typical of what one might hear on each topic. Discuss the differences between American and Soviet societies and ways of thinking that each dialogue illustrates.

Part III Familiarize yourselves with the samples of Soviet propaganda in Part III and refute them in Russian.

I

1. You are walking down a street in Moscow with a colleague. You are involved in a serious discussion and want to make an important point. You start enumerating facts and count them on your fingers for emphasis. Suddenly you notice Russians around you staring at your fingers. Why?

2. You give a pair of baby booties to a Russian woman who is pregnant. Although she thanks you, she is obviously uncomfortable and you realize that you have committed a social blunder. What was it?

3. You pride yourself on being a polite and friendly person. Whenever you pass any of your Russian neighbors in the hall of your apartment building or on the stairs, you make a point of greeting them. Once after politely saying the Russian equivalent of "Hi, how are you?," and walking by with a smile, you hear one of your neighbors say, "Why are these Americans always so rude?" What did the Russian expect of you?

4. You are making your way to your seat at the Bolshoi Theater. You walk past those already seated, saying "Excuse me, please." Someone in the next row says in a stage whisper obviously meant for your ears, "Don't they teach them any manners abroad?" What specific manners might this Russian be referring to?

5. While walking in a neighborhood park, you pass a Russian family you know. They are having lunch. Not wishing to interrupt them while they are eating, you smile, wave "Hi," and walk on. Later you are confronted by a member of the family who demands to know why you are angry with them. Although you insist that you are not, you feel that s/he is unconvinced. How did the family expect you to behave?

6. You are an American woman who has become acquainted with a Russian woman with whom you enjoy talking. One day you meet her on the street and the two of you decide to go to a museum together. As you are walking together she takes your arm. How do you react?

7. You are driving down a Moscow street obeying all traffic laws and regulations. A militiaman stops you and begins to give you a ticket. What is a possible reason?

8. You see an American woman walking down the street in Leningrad. Russian men keep turning around and staring at her. What is a possible reason?

II

1. —Здравствуйте, господин Петров!
—Здравствуйте, господин Смит! Мы с вами уже сегодня здоровались.

2. —Ты что здесь делаешь?
—Я прошу мне не тыкать, прошу обращаться ко мне вежливо.

3. —Вы почему, молодой человек, не уступаете пожилым людям место? Кто вас, интересно, воспитывал?
—Ой, извините, задумался, не заметил старушку.

4. —У Сидорова деньги есть! Я уверен, что он очень богатый человек!
—Почему ты так думаешь?
—Да хотя бы потому, что у него есть собственная машина!

5. —Как же я повезу так много денег?
—Да не бойся! Я зашью их тебе в специальный пояс, ты наденешь его прямо на тело—никто и не заметит, и не догадается.

6. —Какой безобразный фильм! На весь экран—голая женщина! И как это пропускают такие ленты!
—Действительно, а потом удивляются, почему у нас пошла такая молодежь.

7. —Что это вы так легко одеты? Мороз же на улице.
—А вам, простите, какое дело?
—Ты посмотри, ей добра желаешь, а она еще грубит!

8. —Вы что, гражданин, не могли раньше деньги подготовить, заставляете очередь ждать.
—Извините, дорогая, замешкался, уж очень вы красивая.

9. —Сколько можно мерить и мерить! Что это вам—частная лавочка? Поразбросали здесь чуть ли не все костюмы, а ты убирай за ними!
—Ну и что! А вы за что здесь деньги получаете?

10. —Валя, дружище, никогда тебя не забуду. Я знал: сколько бы я у тебя денег ни попросил, ты дашь все, что имеешь.
—Да уж ладно! Кто же поможет в беде, если не друг.
—Так-то это так, но что уже там говорить, не каждый так сразу даст пять тысяч.

11. —Вы что же, разбойники, здесь натворили? Вы что, не знаете, что тут нельзя играть? А ну-ка, скажите, из какой вы школы? Кто ваш директор? Не убежите! Не убежите! У меня ваш портфельчик остался, так что все сама узнаю!
—Бабушка, мы больше не будем! Мы не будем больше, бабушка! Отдайте, пожалуйста, портфель!

12. —Гражданин, предъявите ваши права.
—Вот, пожалуйста, а в чем дело?
—Как в чем? Посмотрите на вашу машину, это не машина, а сплошная грязь! Если себя не уважаете, то подумайте об окружающих.

III

Ознакомьтесь с нижеследующими образцами советской пропаганды и опровергните их.

А.

1. Социализм—самая демократическая система в мире. Социализм превратил советских людей в настоящих хозяев своей страны. Он освободил их от всех форм эксплуатации, уничтожил классовые различия и привилегии.

2. В Советском Союзе нет безработицы, каждый человек имеет право на труд, нищета и голод полностью и до конца ликвидированы.

3. Социалистическое общество гарантирует населению бесплатное медицинское обслуживание, бесплатное образование, самую низкую в мире плату за жилье.

4. Конституция СССР гласит, что все национальности Советского Союза имеют равные права.

5. Советские диссиденты—это горстка предателей Родины. Они никого, кроме самих себя, не представляют.

Б.

1. Внешняя политика Советского Союза--это политика мира и международного сотрудничества.

2. Советский Союз никогда не нарушал международных договоров.

3. Соединенные Штаты вот уже на протяжении более трех десятилетий выступают инициатором гонки стратегических ядерных вооружений.

4. Администрация США по-прежнему делает ставку на военную силу, на достижение военного превосходства, на навязывание другим народам своих порядков.

5. Социализм безоговорочно отвергает войны как средство разрешения межгосударственных политических и экономических противоречий, идеологических споров.

19·
Вопрос Марка
(Mark's Question)

In this section of the Diary, the focus is on the relationship between the individual and his/her government. Nikolai examines this question in detail, touching upon some of the issues discussed earlier but looking at them in a new light.

Upon reading this selection, the student is invited to:

a. Discuss the question of the Soviet citizen vis a vis his/her government, utilizing both the information contained in this section as well as the knowledge of the subject s/he brings to this topic.

b. Discuss the relationship that many different Americans have with their government. How did this relationship evolve? What were some of the contributing factors? How do socioeconomic levels of various population groups affect this relationship?

c. Complete the exercises that follow the text.

I have often heard remarks by Americans who have studied the Soviet Union. They are puzzled by the Russian people's ability to tolerate and support their system. This system has butchered many millions of its own citizens, kept them disinformed, underfed, and creatively and spiritually crushed.

Yet a genuine support and dedication to the Soviet political system can be found, even among the most diversified groups. Many Americans find this paradox troubling.

In attempting to explain the paradox to myself, I came up with the following reasons: the police apparatus, the propaganda/public relations machine, and the absence of a history of democracy.

Many people are, of course, just too scared to voice opposition. After all, they know all too well what happened to those who dared.

The propaganda/public relations machine, through songs, school curriculum, poems, staged events, etc., also helps to evoke genuine feelings of pride in the Soviet State and faith in its superiority over all others. Moreover, it teaches its citizens to think the way the party apparatus finds necessary.

In addition, the lack of a democratic experience helps a citizen feel that even if the government does things that the people themselves don't like, the government must be strong and act like a government. The people's role is to obey and follow. After all, the veche of Novgorod was a long time ago, and the February Revolution was overturned.

All of these factors, as well as the human tendency to value that which is one's own despite obvious faults, do account for some of the support that I have heard expressed. They do not, however, fully explain the sincerity with which I have heard people express their devotion to the State.

The economic achievements of the early years of socialism, the electrification, etc., took enormous sacrifices on the part of the people. These sacrifices could not have been made by those who didn't believe in what they were doing.

Even Solzhenitsyn, who subsequently became disillusioned, wrote that the Russian revolution was magnificent and just, there had been a long period in which the people in charge of everything important in our country had been people of lofty intentions and totally dedicated.[2]

Idealism and faith in the revolution seem to have been very widespread phenomena. In fact, it can still be found today. I cannot believe that this sincere idealism can be fully explained by terror, propaganda, or the absence of democracy. It seems too deeply rooted for that. Why is this so?

20·
Ответ Николая
(Nikolai's Answer)

Почему? Потому что, помимо всех причин, которые ты назвал, и других, менее значительных, которых ты не назвал, есть ещё одна, с моей точки зрения, главная причина: иллюзия существования в Советском Союзе общественной формы собственности. Сила этой иллюзии объясняется тем, что в нее долгое время верил весь государственно-партийный аппарат, большая часть советской интеллигенции, миллионы простых советских людей. Верил ли в эту иллюзию Троцкий, когда говорил, что большевики в России собираются провести новый по качеству социальный эксперимент; верил ли в нее Сталин, заявивший в 1945 году, что СССР разгромил Германию прежде всего благодаря существованию в стране общественной формы собственности на средства производства; верил ли в эту иллюзию Хрущёв, любивший у вас, в Америке, подчёркивать, что он является представителем русского рабочего класса; верили ли в неё сотни учёных, принимавших резолюции о развитии общественного производства; верил ли в нее простой рабочий Карцев из поэмы Е. Евтушенко "Братская ГЭС" – этот рабочий, несмотря на страшные издевательства и мучения (его допрашивали в ГПУ), несмотря на все трудности и невзгоды, шептал: "Пусть плохо нам, пусть будет ещё хуже, не продадим, товарищ Ленин, души, и коммунизма мы не продадим."[4] Верили ли они? В том-то и дело, что верили. В том-то и была трагедия. Вера в то, что в СССР заводы и фабрики, земля и жилища, в общем, все принадлежит народу, и явилась той почвой, на которой только и могла произойти страшная рубка миллионов невинных людей. Именно эта иллюзия объясняет невиданное в истории массовое несопротивление злу. Где это было слыхано, чтобы убиваемый, погибая, приветствовал своего палача, чтобы тысячи безвинных людей, погибая, думали о справедливости общества, которое сжило их со света! "Партия и народ – едины!" Вот откуда это пошло. Раз все принадлежит всем, значит, государство – народное, значит, оно заботится о народе, значит, ему виднее, что нужно и что не нужно.

Между тем в СССР никакой общественной собственности нет. В Советском Союзе все принадлежит не народу, не трудящимся, а новому классу – государственно-партийному аппарату. Является ли этот аппарат классом? Да, он имеет все характеристики общественного класса. Во-первых, он насчитывает около трёх миллионов человек, во-вторых, он занимает определённое место в системе общественного производства, которое позволяет ему сосредоточить в руках все командные посты в хозяйстве страны.[5] В результате этот класс обеспечивает себя самой высокой зарплатой, самой качественной пищей и самой лучшей одеждой. Он имеет право на бесплатные машины, дачи и другие привилегии. Это ему достается львиная доля национального дохода. Состоящий из высокооплачиваемых и привилегированных чиновников, этот класс готов на самую жестокую борьбу за сохранение однопартийной системы, являющейся политической основой его существования. Ради сохранения этой системы партийные, государственные и военные круги, образующие этот класс, преследуют любое свободомыслие, потворствуют шовинизму и антисемитизму, раздувают лже-патриотизм, воспитывают культ приспособленчества и подобострастия, лицемерят, запугивают, лгут, закрывают глаза на вопиющие недостатки в жизни общества. Ради сохранения этого режима они постепенно уступают объективным требованиям дня, идут на реформаторские ужимочки, заигрывают иногда с оппозиционными настроениями. Государственно-партийный класс хорошо организован, отлично понимает свои цели и задачи, великолепно очищен от неугодных ему лиц и представляет собой грозную реакционную силу.

Однако откуда же взялась иллюзия общественной собственности, почему она возникла и почему она и сейчас сохраняется среди некоторой части населения? Выяснить это очень важно, поскольку вся советская идеология, вся пропаганда, вся мораль, весь советский и трудовой, и военный патриотизм, вся так называемая национальная гордость,

63

всё общественное мнение, все политические убеждения строятся и основываются на этой иллюзии. Конечно, большую роль в формировании иллюзии общественной собственности сыграли такие явления, как революционный переворот в крестьянской стране, отсутствие демократических норм общественной жизни, аппарат насилия, лживость пропаганды, культ Сталина, гонения против религии и т.д. Однако есть и ряд специальных явлений, особо повлиявших на довольно длительное функционирование этой иллюзии.

Первым среди них можно назвать отмену частной собственности. Когда отменяют частную собственность и при этом заявляют, что заводы переходят к рабочим, а земля – к крестьянам, когда вам убежденно втолковывают, что отныне не будет ни помещиков, ни капиталистов и что все становится народным достоянием, тогда вам (особенно если вы крестьянин, или рабочий и испытываете ненависть к этим помещикам и капиталистам, потому что ваша жизнь полна невзгод), тогда вам не трудно поверить в то, чего нет на самом деле. Отмена частной собственности и ее отсутствие – это тот фундамент, на котором возникла массовая иллюзия о существовании общественной формы собственности. Будь в стране частная собственность – кто бы поверил в сказку о коммунизме? Поэтому так люто новый класс боится всяких частнособственнических проявлений и душит их в зародыше. Частная собственность – это вообще основа самостоятельного политического мнения. Помимо этого, если вы чем-нибудь владеете, то вас очень трудно убедить, что все остальное в стране тоже принадлежит вам. Это гораздо легче сделать, когда у вас нет ничего.

Следующее явление – медленный рост нового класса. Ведь только к 1930 году партия большевиков достигла 1.000.000 человек. Когда же большевики пришли к власти, их было всего 240.000.[6] Трудно было понять, что на социальную арену страны вышел новый класс. Создавалось впечатление, что большевики выражают интересы трудового населения России. Такое впечатление усиливалось, понятно, тем, что большевики сами в это верили. Формированию иллюзии способствовал и социальный состав правящей партийно-государственной верхушки, которая на 70-80% состояла из бывших рабочих и крестьян Уж раз наши секретари и министры из простых людей, то уже само собой понятно, что все в стране принадлежит нам, народу. Это лишь потом стал ясно, что эти рабочие и крестьяне уже давно не рабочие и крестьяне, а чиновники, бюрократы, составляющие ядро нового класса. Это уже потом стало ясно, что после сформирования нового класса ни одному рабочему и ни одному крестьянину туда уже не попасть.

Немалую роль в формировании иллюзии общественной формы собственности сыграли революционный идеализм первой плеяды большевиков, совершивших революцию ради великих идеалов. Эти люди мешали новому классу становиться на ноги и поэтому совершенно закономерно были физически уничтожены И. Сталиным. В чем проявлялся их революционный идеализм? Прежде всего этот идеализм требовал скромности и аскетичности от правящий верхушки. Известно, что ленинское положение о партмаксимуме, устанавливающее определенные и весьма существенные ограничения для оплаты бюрократии, действовало вплоть до 1932 года, а его отмена и принятие ряда законов, увеличивающих доходы чиновников, нигде не афишировались и реализовывались почти секретно. Короче, это лишь потом разница в доходах между простым рабочим и чиновником высокого ранга достигла потрясающей пропорции 1:100. Вначале же она была предельна мала 1:5.[7] Это материальное равноправие несомненно являлось одним из источников, порождающих иллюзии существования в стране общественной формы собственности.

Другим важнейшим источником этой иллюзии выступила способность государственно-партийного аппарата на принятие ряда пропагандистских мер по улучшению материального уровня жизни населения. Контроль правящего класса над бюджетом всей страны создает ему идеальные условия для обмана населения, для проведения мероприятий и реформ в "интересах" народа. На самом же деле правящий класс прежде всего думает о своих собственных интересах, о своей собственной материальной выгоде. Народ же интересует государственно-партийный аппарат только по одной причине: государственно-партийному аппарату важно, чтобы народ не умер с голода, чтобы он, давая максимальную прибыль, не был при этом доведен до крайнего состояния. И это вполне естественно: народ – кормилец бюрократии, основное средство ее существования. Между прочим, суть советского "социализма" на современном этапе и заключается в том, как бы побольше взять у народа, не вызывая его гнева и возмущения. Отсюда такие черты советского образа жизни, как систематическое снижение розничных цен на товары первой необходимости, сопровождающееся ухудшением качества этих товаров, незаметным повышением цен на другие товары, отсутствием ряда товаров в продаже, общим ростом стоимости жизни, скрытой инфляцией; отсюда бесплатная медицинская помощь за счёт низкого уровня обслуживания и почти бесплатной работы врачей; отсюда бесплатное образование – государство заставляет население платить за него, но не прямо, а через систему других финансовых каналов. Короче, все мероприятия такого рода носят пропагандистский характер, потому что реальная жизнь населения остаётся на низком уровне и не соответствует экономическим возможностям страны. При всем при этом способность государственного аппарата к принятию мер, пропагандистски направленных на улучшение материальной жизни народа, до сих пор питает иллюзию существования в СССР общественной формы собственности.

Наконец, нельзя не сказать о таком факторе как внешняя угроза. Недаром военно-патриотическое воспитание в СССР стоит на недосягаемом для многих стран уровне. Внешний враг объединяет государственно-партийный аппарат с населением, создает их реальное единство, которое, в свою очередь, питает иллюзорное социально-экономическое единство этих двух противоположных сил. Возьмите войну 1941-45 г. Память об этой войне свято живёт в сердцах всех советских людей. Эта память в названиях улиц и площадей, в песнях и симфониях, ей посвящены спектакли и фильмы, праздники и парады. И здесь нет никакого отклонения от нормы. Народ, который отдал 20 миллионов жизней ради победы, имеет право на долгую память о погибших. В то же время государственно-партийный аппарат умело использует эту память для ослабления все усиливающего противоречия между ним и населением. Многие недостатки в экономике страны, вызванные деятельностью самого государственно-партийного аппарата, объясняются последствиями Великой Отечественной войны. Преувеличивается роль государственно-партийного аппарата в организации обороны: этот аппарат, как мы уже знаем, уничтожил лучших полководцев страны, заигрывал с фашизмом и допустил ряд грубейших ошибок, вызвавших десятки тысяч ненужных жертв. Помимо этого военно-патриотическое воспитание особенно рьяно пропагандирует культ единой Родины – "Родина у нас одна на всех", что помогает трансформировать понятие Родины как единой территории в понятие Родины как совокупности богатств, принадлежащих всему населению в равной степени. Всякая внешняя угроза используется государственно-партийным аппаратом для укрепления морально-политического (читай: материального) единства советских людей.

В каком же состоянии сейчас находится иллюзия общественной формы собственности? В состоянии разложения, распада, эрозии. Чем дальше идёт общественной развитие страны, тем яснее: сказка об общественной собственности противоречит действительности, не согласуется с ней, вступает в конфликт с фактами и с реальной жизнью. Чем дальше, тем больше людей начинает это чувствовать и понимать. Как же проявляется распад иллюзии? В области общественного мнения он прежде всего проявляется в формальном исповедовании всей советской идеологической системы, в неверии в эту систему, в потрясающем по своему размаху явлении массового политического лицемерия. Говорим одно, но думаем другое – вот суть общественного мнения в СССР. Говорят одно, но думают другое представители государственно-партийного аппарата. Говорит одно, но думает другое большинство населения Советского Союза. Конечно, происходит это по разным причинам. Государственно-партийный аппарат давно понял, чью собаку съел, но прикрываться старыми лозунгами и фразами ему просто выгодно, и он это будет делать до тех пор, пока сам не поймет, что жить в чешуе слов старой идеологии –значит быть посмешищем для окружающих. Население же не до конца осознало ложь старой идеологии, в своей массе население больше чувствует, чем понимает эту ложь. Без сомнения, страх перед репрессиями здесь также играет немаловажную роль, но его не следует преувеличивать.

Однако эрозия иллюзии народной собственности проявляется не только в формальном исповедовании, безверии и лицемерии, эта эрозия находит своё отражение и в прямом отрицании существующих политических положений и норм. Доказательство этому – советское диссиденство. Сила советских диссидентов сейчас не в том, каковы они есть, а в том, что они есть, в том, что они существуют. Истинное отношение к существующей идеологии, к сказке о народной собственности проявляется также в частных разговорах, "задушевных" беседах, в так называемом, "общественном шёпоте" и особенно в политических анекдотах, которые в последнее время буквально затопили страну.

В области национальных отношений эрозия проявилась в усилении националистических тенденций среди всех народов СССР. Раз идеи коммунизма – это ложь, раз в стране никто ни во что не верит, значит и братство народов существует на бумаге. Русские, – рассуждают в других республиках, – нам пели песенки об интернационализме, а сами захватили в свои руки центральную власть и через вторых секретарей национальных республик (они, как правило, все русские) и военных установили полный контроль над нами. Мы – никто, у нас нет никакой самостоятельности, а ведь мы тоже нация, и у нас есть богатая культура и славные традиции, и у нас есть свой язык (а нас заставляют учить русский!), и мы сами способны представлять себя на международных совещаниях и конференциях. С другой стороны, и русские сейчас начинают понимать, что идеи "строителей коммунизма" уже не объединяют их с другими национальностями СССР, что общенациональное исповедавание этих идей катастрофически падает, что вера в русскую религиозность, в "русский дух", в русское величие гораздо важнее, гораздо реальнее, чем вера в некое "интернациональное единство" всех наций, что сдавать свои великодержавные привилегии другим, более мелким нациям, было бы не солидно и не серьёзно.

В области культуры налицо уход от прямого восхваления партийных деяний (что было характерно для времени расцвета иллюзии), интерес к интимному миру, к личной жизни, к человеческим отношениям, раздумьям и переживаниям. Агитки же типа "Целины" Брежнева не только вызывают скрытую усмешку и пренебрежение, но и полностью приводят к противоположным результатам: они ещё больше усиливают недоверие к деятельности партии и её лидеров. Большой резонанс получают произведения "тонкого" намёка на "толстые" обстоятельства. Случайно оброненная реплика актёра, намекающая на правительственную несправедливость, вызывает бурю аплодисментов; стихи о стремлении к свободе приводят в восторг читателей; живопись, идущая против официальных канонов, воспринимается как протест против насилия над свободомыслием; песня о пьянице таит в себе намек на социальные причины, приведшие его к духовному обнищанию и т.д. В невиданных для Советского Союза масштабах распространяется подпольная литература – самиздат, который читают ночами, тайно передают друг другу, перепечатывают, ради которого рискуют благополучием и карьерой. Лучшие представители литературы не выдерживают внутреннего и внешнего давления лжи и переходят грань дозволенного сверху – говорят страшную в условиях советского общества вещь, говорят, что король голый, говорят правду. Их немедленно выбрасывают заграницу, на их тут же заменяют другие, потому что иллюзия тает, исчезает, теряет свое содержание и смысл.

Наконец, в области экономической (и это, пожалуй, самое главное), происходит настоящий развал. Дело в том, что рабочий уже не верит, что завод принадлежит ему, а крестьянин уже точно знает, что земля не является его собственностью. Для населения становится всё яснее, что оно работает не на себя, а на государство и что интересы государства и населения не совпадают. Работник труда чувствует, что собственность отчуждена от него, что она не имеет к нему никакого отношения, что, более того, она враждебна ему, не даёт ему никакой материальной выгоды и (это очень важно!) не оплачивает в достаточной мере его трудовую энергию. Отсюда резкое падение производительности труда, подъем которой в Советском Союзе совершенно (при данных экономических условиях) невозможно. Помимо этого,работник труда, чувствуя, что оплата его труда является предельно низкой и что результаты труда ему не принадлежат, начинает осознавать несправедливость экономической системы "социализма". Именно поэтому воровство в СССР носит массовый характер. Воруют все и везде, воруют нянечки и продавщицы, шофёры и трактористы, колхозники и научные работники, военные и гражданские. Воруют масло и гвозди, спирт и бензин, детали и оборудование, но больше всего воруют рабочее время. С особой силой расцветают различные формы подпольной частно-собственнической деятельности: перепродажа книг, вещей и жилплощади, торговля должностями и взяточничество, организация собственного бизнеса, а в некоторых случаях даже целых предприятий – все это, несмотря на юридические препоны, бурлит на дне "социализма" и ищет выхода.

Что же будет дальше? Дальше будет – изменение. Государственный аппарат или уступит населению, которое начинает понимать, что его зверски эксплуатируют, или (на время, конечно) превратит это население в рабов. Первый путь (а он, с моей точки зрения, более возможный) ведет к перерождению государственного аппарата, а второй – к его свержению. Следовательно, демократизация государственного аппарата объективна, необходима и наступит, несмотря на самое бешеное сопротивление диктаторского режима.

TRANSLATION OF NIKOLAI'S ANSWER

Why? Because, in addition to all the reasons cited (and other, less significant reasons which were not cited), there is another reason. It is the primary reason, in our opinion: the illusion of the existence of public ownership of property in the Soviet Union. The power of this illusion can be explained by the fact that the entire party-state apparatus, a large segment of the Soviet intelligentsia, and millions of ordinary Soviet citizens believed in it for a long time. Did Trotsky believe in this illusion when he proclaimed that the Bolsheviks intended to conduct a qualitatively new social experiment in Russia? Did Stalin believe in it when he declared in 1945 that the Soviet Union had defeated Germany above all because of the existence in the country of public ownership of the means of production? Did Khrushchev believe in this illusion, taking delight, here in America, in emphasizing that he was a representative of the Russian working class? Did hundreds of scientists, adopting resolutions on the development of communal production, believe in it? Did the common laborer Kartsev, in Yevtushenko's poem "The Bratsk Hydroelectric Power Station," believe in it? This working man, despite frighful mockery and torture (he was interrogated by the GPU), who whispered, despite all hardships and adversity: "Even if things are bad, even if they get worse, we shall not sell our souls, Comrade Lenin, and we won't sell our Communism either."[3]

Did they believe? That's just the point; they did believe. In fact, herein lies the tragedy. A belief that in the USSR everything in general belongs to the people--factories, plants, land, and housing--was just the grounds on which such a horrible massacre of millions of innocent people could have occurred. It is precisely this illusion which explains submission to evil. Where have we ever heard of a situation in which the victim, dying, greeted his executioner, and thousands of innocent people, in their death throes, reflected on the fairness of the society which snuffed out their lives? "The party and the people are united!" This is where it stemmed from. Since everything belongs to all, then the State belongs to the people, then it cares about the people, then it is more apparent to the State what the people need and what they do not need.

But in the meantime there is no public property in the USSR. In the Soviet Union, everything belongs not to the people, not to the workers, not to the working class, but to the new class: the party-state apparatus. Is this apparatus a class? Yes, it bears all the characteristics of a class. First of all, it numbers about 3 million members. Secondly, it plays a definite role in the system of production in the society, enabling it to concentrate, in its hands, all top positions in the economy of the country.[4] As a result, this class provides itself with the highest incomes, the highest-quality food, and the very best clothing. It is entitled to free automobiles, dachas, rights, and privileges. It receives a disproportionate lion's share of the national income. Consisting of highly-paid and privileged bureaucrats, this class is prepared for the most brutal struggle to preserve the one-party system. Party, state, and military circles comprising this class persecute any free thought, pander to chauvinism and anti-Semitism, arouse false patriotism, propagate the cult of time-serving and servility, engage in hypocrisy, intimidation, and lies, and close their eyes to scandalous shortcomings in our social life. In order to preserve the regime, this class gradually yields to the objective demands of the day, feigns reform with a grimace, and sometimes flirts with opposition viewpoints. The party-state class is well-organized, has a thorough understanding of its objectives and tasks, is thoroughly purged of elements it finds objectionable, and represents a formidable reactionary force.

But where did the illusion of public property originate? Why have professions of this illusion occurred (and still do, within a certain segment of the population)? It is very important to explain this, since all Soviet ideology, all propaganda, all ethics, all Soviet labor and military patriotism, all so-called national pride, all public opinion, and all political beliefs are built and based on this illusion. Of course, a major role in the formulation of the illusion of public property has been played by such phenomena as the revolutionary upheaval in a peasant country, the absence of democratic norms in public life, the apparatus of coercion, deceitful propaganda, the cult of Stalin, the persecution of free thought and religion, etc. However, there are a number of special phenomena with a particular bearing on the rather long-standing functioning of this illusion.

The first of these may be designated the abolition of private property. When one is deprived of his/her private property, and in the process it is declared that factories are being turned over to the workers, and land to the peasants, when one is persuasively made to understand that from now on there will be no landowners or capitalists, and that everything will become public property (especially if one is a peasant or worker and hates these landowners and capitalists, since his/her life is full of adversity), then s/he has no difficulty in believing that which in fact is not so. The abolition of private property and its absence constitutes the foundation on which the mass illusion concerning the existence of public property originated. If there were private property in the country, who would believe in the fairy tale of communism? And that is why the new (ruling) class is so deathly afraid of any manifestations of private property and nips them in the bud. Private property–this is generally the source for evolution of personal, independent political opinion. Moreover, if you own something, it is very difficult to convince you that everything else in the country belongs to you. This is far easier to do when you own nothing.

The next phenomenon is the slow growth of the new (ruling) class. The fact is that the Bolshevik Party did not attain a membership of one million until 1930. When the Bolsheviks came to power, there were only 240,000 of them.[5] It was difficult to understand then that a new class had entered the social arena of the country. The impression was created that the Bolsheviks reflected the interests of the working class of Russia. Such an impression, of course, was reinforced by the fact that the Bolsheviks themselves believed this. Formulation of the illusion was also facilitated by the social composition of the ruling party-state leadership, the majority of whom comprised former workers and peasants. Since our secretaries and ministers were common people, it was already self-evident that everything in the country belongs to us, the people.

Only later did it become apparent that these workers and peasants had long since ceased to be workers and peasants, but were party functionaries and bureaucrats, comprising the nucleus of the new (ruling) class. Only later did it become evident that, after the formation of the new class, no worker or peasant would become a part of it.

A significant role in the formation of the illusion of ownership of public property was played by the revolutionary idealism of the first outstanding group of Bolsheviks, who engineered the revolution for the sake of lofty ideals. These people prevented the new class from becoming firmly established, and therefore were physically annihilated by Stalin, out of sheer necessity. How was their revolutionary idealism manifested? First and foremost, this idealism demanded modesty and asceticism from the ruling clique. We know that the Leninist position on maximum salary for Party members, establishing definite and quite significant income ceilings for the bureaucracy, was in effect until 1932, and its abolition and the adoption of a number of laws increasing the incomes of party functionaries were never advertised, and were implemented in virtual secrecy. In short, this subsequent differential in income between the ordinary worker and the high-ranking functionary achieved the staggering ratio of 1 : 100. Initially, it was an extremely modest 1 : 5.[6] This approximate material equality was undoubtedly one of the factors giving rise to the illusion of the existence of public ownership of property in the country.

Emerging as another most important source of this illusion was the ability of the party-state apparatus to adopt a number of propaganda measures to improve the material standard of living of the people. The control by the ruling class of the budget of the entire country creates ideal conditions enabling it to deceive the people, to implement measures and reforms in the "interest" of the people. As a matter of fact, the ruling class thinks, first and foremost, in terms of its own selfish interests, its own material advantage. The people are of interest to the party-state apparatus for the following reason: the party-state apparatus sees to it that the people do not die of hunger, so that the latter, yielding maximum profit to the party-state apparatus, are not reduced to a state of desperation in the process. And this is perfectly natural: the people feed the bureaucracy and are the principal basis for its existence. Incidentally, the essence of Soviet "socialism," in its present state, comes down to a question of how much more can be taken from the people without arousing their anger and indignation.

Hence such characteristics of the Soviet way of life as the systematic reduction in retail prices of the necessities of life, accompanied by a deterioration in the quality of these goods, an imperceptible increase in the price of other goods, the absence of a number of goods in stock, an overall increase in the cost of living, and hidden inflation. Hence free medical care, at the cost of low-level treatment and doctors working almost without pay. Hence free education–the state forces the people to pay for it–not directly, but through a network of other fiscal channels. In short, all such measures have a propagandistic bent, inasmuch as the real standard of living of the people remains low and is inconsistent with the economic potential of the country. But the ability of the state apparatus to adopt measures propagandistically aimed at an improvement in the material welfare of the people nourishes, to this day, the illusion of the existence of public ownership of property in the USSR.

Finally, it is impossible not to mention another factor: the external threat. Understandably, military-patriotic indoctrination in the USSR is at a level unattained by many other countries. The external enemy unites the party-state apparatus with the people and creates for them a real unity which, in turn, nourishes the illusory socioeconomic unity of these two contending forces. Take, for example, the 1941-1945 war. The memory of this war is revered in the hearts of all the people of the Soviet Union. This memory is preserved in the names of streets and squares, in songs and symphonies. Plays and films, holidays, and parades are dedicated to it. And this is no deviation from the norm. The people, who sacrificed 20 million lives to achieve victory, have a right to long remember the victims. By the same token, the party-state apparatus skillfully exploits this remembrance to attenuate the ever-increasing contradiction between itself and the people. Many shortcomings in the domestic economy, stemming from the actions of the party-state apparatus itself, are explained as the consequences of the Great Patriotic War.

The role of the party-state apparatus in the organization of defense is exaggerated. This apparatus, as we already know, liquidated the top military leadership of the country, flirted with fascism, and permitted a number of the gravest errors, causing tens of thousands of unnecessary sacrifices. Moreover, the military-patriotic indoctrination propagates, with particular zeal, the cult of a united Motherland ("Our Motherland belongs to all of us"), which facilitates transformation of the concept of the Motherland as a single territory to the concept of the Motherland as an aggregate of resources belonging to all the people in equal measure. Any external threat is utilized by the party-state apparatus to reinforce the moral-political (read: material) unity of the Soviet people.

What is the present state of the illusion of public ownership of property? It's in a state of disintegration, decay, erosion. The greater the level of social development of the country, the clearer this disintegration becomes. The fairy tale notion of public property contradicts reality, is inconsistent with reality, comes into conflict with the facts and with real life. The longer this illusion is perpetuated, the more the people begin to feel that it is only an illusion.

How is the disintegration of this illusion manifested? In the realm of public opinion, this disintegration is manifested, first and foremost, in a purely formal profession of the entire Soviet ideological system, in a disbelief in this system, and in mass political hypocrisy of staggering proportions. We say one thing and believe another–this is the essence of public opinion in the USSR. The representatives of the party-state apparatus say one thing, but believe another. The majority of the population of the Soviet Union says one thing, but believes another. Of course, this occurs for a variety of reasons. The party-state apparatus understood, long ago, which side its bread is buttered on, but it was simply to its advantage to conceal this understanding with tired slogans and clichés. And the party-state apparatus will continue to do so until it understands itself that to continue mouthing slogans of the old ideology would be tantamount to becoming everyone's laughing-stock. The people are hypocritical because they have not completely perceived the falsity of the ideology. In the aggregate, the people have a better feeling for, rather than understanding of, this lie. Fear of repression also undoubtedly plays a major role, but it should not be exaggerated.

But the erosion of the illusion of public property is manifested not only in a purely formal profession, disbelief, and hypocrisy. This erosion is also reflected in the direct rejection of existing political tenets and norms. Soviet dissidence is proof of this. The true feeling toward current ideology, toward the fairy-tale notion of public ownership, is also manifested in private conversations, in "heart-to-heart" talks, in a so-called "whisper in public," and especially in political anecdotes, which have literally inundated the country of late.

In the realm of relations between nationalities, the erosion has been manifested in a reinforcement of nationalistic tendencies among all the peoples of the USSR. Since the tenets of communism are a lie, and since nobody believes them, the brotherhood of people exists only on paper. The Russians sang songs to us about internationalism, but they themselves took power into their own hands and, through the second secretaries of the national republics (all of whom, as a rule, are Russians) and military leaders, established full control over us. We are nobodies, we have no independence, and yet we too as a nation have a culture and rich heritage. We too have a language of our own and yet are forced to learn Russian. And we too are able to represent ourselves at international meetings and conferences. On the other hand, the Russian people are also now beginning to understand that the tenets of the "builders of communism" no longer unite them with the other nationalities of the USSR; that the profession of these tenets by all nationalities is experiencing a catastrophic drop; that a belief in Russian piety, in "the Russian soul," in Russian grandeur, is far more important, much more real, than a belief in some sort of "international unity" of all nations; that to surrender one's great-power privileges to other, smaller nations would not be sound or serious.

On the cultural scene, there has been a clear departure from immediate praise of party deeds (which was characteristic of the period of the flowering of this illusion). We now have a clear interest in intimacy, a personal life, in human relations, meditation, and emotions. Propaganda works such as Virgin Soil not only provoke a hidden smile and scorn, but even lead to completely opposite results: they further enhance disbelief in the actions of the party and its leaders. Productions involving a "gentle hint" of "heavy circumstances" meet with great applause. An accidentally dropped replica of an actor, alluding to governmental injustice, provokes stormy applause. Poems concerning the striving for freedom incite delight in the readers. A painting which violates official standards is perceived as a protest against the persecution of free thought. A song about a drunk conceals a hint as to the social causes leading him to spiritual impoverishment, etc. Underground literature is being produced on a scale unprecedented in the Soviet Union. Samizdat, which is read at night, is passed on from one to another and duplicated, for the sake of which all involved risk their well-being and careers. The best authors cannot withstand the internal and external pressure of the lie, and transcend the limits permitted from above. They say frightful things, given the conditions of Soviet society–they proclaim that the king is naked, they speak the truth. They are immediately exiled from the country, but others take their place, because the illusion is dissolving, disappearing, losing its content and meaning.

Finally, in the economic sphere (and this is perhaps the most important), a real disintegration is occurring. The fact is that the workers no longer believe that the factory belongs to them and the peasants are no longer convinced that the land is their property. It is becoming increasingly more apparent to the people that they are working not for themselves but for the state, and that the interests of the state and those of the people do not coincide. Workers feel that property is alien to them, that they bear no relation to it; that, moreover, it is hostile. It does not provide them any material gain, and (this is very important) that they are not sufficiently remunerated for their labor. Hence the sharp drop in the productivity of labor, the restoration of which (under present economic conditions) is totally out of the question in the Soviet Union. Moreover, the workers, feeling that their pay is rock-bottom and that the results of their labor do not accrue to them, begin to perceive the injustice of the economic system of "socialism." It is precisely for this reason that thievery exists on a massive scale in the USSR. Everybody steals, and everywhere: nurses and salespeople, drivers and tractor operators, workers on collective farms, and scientists, military personnel, and civilians. They steal butter and nails, alcohol and gasoline, parts and equipment, but above all they steal working time. Various forms of underground private enterprise are flourishing on a grandiose scale: the resale of books, possessions, and living spaces; the purchase of positions; bribery; the organization of private business; and in some instances even whole enterprises–all of this, despite legal obstacles, seethes at the very root of "socialism" and seeks an outlet.

What will the future bring? The future will bring change. The state apparatus will either yield to the people, who are beginning to understand that they are being brutally exploited, or (for a time, of course) will transform the population into slaves. The former, which I believe to be most likely, will lead to a rebirth of the state apparatus, and the latter to its overthrow. As a consequence, democratization of the state apparatus is objective and necessary, and will occur, despite the most persistent resistance of the dictatorial regime.

Ответьте на вопросы по прочитанным материалам.

а. О каком противоречии в социально-политической жизни Советского Союза говорит в своём письме Марк? Какие причины, с точки зрения Марка, частично объясняют это противоречие? Почему Марк считает, что эти причины недостаточно раскрывают сущность противоречия? Если вы согласны с Марком, то постарайтесь найти дополнительные причины, объясняющие то противоречие, о котором он говорит. Если вы не согласны с ним, то постарайтесь обосновать свою точку зрения.

б. Как, с точки зрения Николая, в СССР сформировалась иллюзия общественной собственности? Почему Николай считает, что общественная собственность в СССР – иллюзия? Как отражается исчезновение этой иллюзии в различных аспектах общественной жизни России? Согласны ли вы с Николаем?

21·
Перестройка
(Perestroika)

Read this section of Mark Smith's Diary and write a short paper in Russian with your comments on perestroika and glasnost. Use both the information presented here as well as what you have learned about these topics from other sources.

Mark: Nikolai, I have just reread my diary from 1983-85 that contains your detailed comments and analysis. In view of what has occurred in recent years, I found your predictions of change particularly interesting. Do you feel that allowing private economic initiatives, *khozraschet*, private restaurants, taxis, and other small businesses, as well as the new law allowing complaints about officials, can be viewed as the party apparatus simply giving in to the people out of necessity for the sake of self-preservation? Are there other motives? Is Gorbachev fighting primarily to save his own class or is he motivated by other considerations?

Николай: Я до сих пор совершенно уверен, что цель перестройки -- это спасение номенклатуры. Однако трудно сказать, что по этому поводу думает Горбачёв. Может быть, он именно так и думает. В то же время не исключено, что он стоит на позиции патриота, который просто озабочён тяжёлым положением в стране. Не исключено даже, что в глубине души он понимает: марксизм больше не функционирует, его необходимо реконструировать, изменить. Возможно также, что в его голове все эти концепции существуют одновременно. Главное не то, что от думает, а то, что он делает. Пока же всё, что делает Горбачёв, подтверждает мой анализ: правящий класс спасает политическую систему, при которой ему хорошо живётся. Конечно, при этом возможно определённое улучшение экономики, но эта экономика без борьбы не перейдет в руки населения. Я уже не говорю о политической власти.

Кстати, а что вы, американцы, думаете о нашей перестройке?

Mark: What do you mean, "What do Americans think?" America is not the Soviet Union, you know. There simply isn't *one* "American opinion" on a political question. There isn't even a unified "official American opinion." Why do you think it's so hard to figure out which way American foreign policy is heading? Maybe that's the whole difference. You guys really do have *one* opinion, at least officially. From the point of view of differences in mentalities, this really *does* constitute a major difference.

Николай: Согласен. Это действительно бросающаяся в глаза разница. Но только когда мы говорим об официальной советской печати, об официальной точке зрения, об официальной позиции. Во всех остальных случаях мы в СССР наблюдаем сейчас довольно заметный плюрализм, и хотя этот плюрализм, конечно же, менее богат, чем в США, он, без сомнения, существует.

Mark: Well, and what sort of different opinions have you heard expressed concerning *perestroika*?

Николай: Одни, например, считают, что перестройка -- это улучшение социализма, это необходимый этап в развитии страны с целью преодоления накопившихся сложностей и перехода на более высокий уровень политического и экономического развития; другие, как и я, думают, что перестройка -- это только очередной тактический ход номенклатуры, ведущий к подогреванию угасающей веры населения в политическую систему; третьи видят в перестройке просто ряд мер по восстановлению некоторых элементов частной собственности, которые вводятся на длительный срок для улучшения положения в стране;

четвёртые полагают, что перестройка -- это только способ, с помощью которого Горбачёв консолидирует свою власть; пятые уверяют, что перестройка -- это начало отказа от идеологии марксизма, это желание улучшить положение населения, рискуя уже сложившимися политическими традициями, организациями и ценностями.

Mark: Those differences in opinions which you have just expressed reflect differences in the individuals who state them. I cannot help but think, however, that there are certain common traits in the political behavior of citizens that every society produces. Soviet citizens are considered by many to be politically passive, to mistrust and fear their government, and to lack a history of a democratic approach. My question to you is how will these types of characteristics in the Soviet people affect perestroika?

Николай: Как повлияют? Посмотрите, как медленно, пассивно и недоверчиво реагирует простое население на призывы к перестройке. У населения отличная память. Оно помнит, как крестьянству дали сначала землю, а потом отобрали, как ввели НЭП, а потом всех нэпманов пересажали, как говорили при Хрущёве о хозрасчёте, а затем тихонько этот хозрасчёт прикрыли. Всё это надолго сформировало недоверчивое и пассивное отношение населения к политическим призывам и кампаниям! Нужно немало времени, чтобы эти качества политической ментальности населения трансформировались в свою противоположность. У меня есть один приятель, простой рабочий из Тулы. Так он как-то заметил: «Перестройка! Перестройка! Что мне от этой перестройки, когда в магазинах до сих пор свободно мясо не купить!»

Mark: It seems to me that in America our shared history has produced a different attitude. Lobbyists, media campaigns undertaken by various political groups, protest demonstrations and marches--all attest to political activity. So does the fact that there have been 10,124 proposed constitutional amendments to date. It is interesting to note that while I have heard the widest range of opinions expressed about a given administration, domestic or foreign policy, or a Supreme Court justice nominee, I can't recall any group advocating the convening of a new constitutional convention and totally changing the existing one. If there were such a group, however, the existing constitution is the very document that would guarantee its right to attempt such an overhaul.

Николай: Наша же история, то есть долгая жизнь советских людей в условиях диктатуры, привела их к неспособности открытого выражения чувств и мыслей. С одной стороны, они склонны к немедленному послушанию, к почти автоматическому выполнению всех требований правящего аппарата, к подобострастному обожествлению своих вождей, с другой стороны – к бунту, к насильственному свержению всех устоявшихся основ политической структуры общества. Это, мне кажется, делает процесс перестройки сложным и непредсказуемым. Хотя справедливости ради необходимо отметить, что сейчас появляются первые попытки реальной демократизации общества. Я имею в виду вновь созданные клубы и тенденцию к созданию второй партии.

Mark: In that case, can the current reforms bring about a democratic form of government in the USSR instead of a dictatorship, one that reflects the interests of the entire population and not just the nomenklatura?

Николай: В конечном итоге -- да.

Mark: Let's discuss glasnost. The usual English definition is openness. This is rather vague. What exactly does it mean in your society?

Николай: Я думаю, что слово «гласность» в русском языке имеет два значения. Во-первых, гласность -- это когда все всё знают, ничего не скрывается от людей; во-вторых, под гласностью понимается определенная степень критики политической системы.

Mark: I think that to an American the word openness also has the connotation of criticism. This can mean criticism of anything at all. Are there limits to the criticism allowed now?

Николай: Я бы сказал, что предел гласности -- это возможность критиковать социализм , возможность выражать сомнение в его необходимости и полезности, это отрицание положительной роли КПСС в развитии общества. Однако это только крайний предел. На самом деле в СССР ещё и сейчас при гласности запрещено очень много вещей. И это естественно, потому что ещё до сих пор СССР не является обществом, подчинающимся вырабатанному и одобренному населением законодательству. Воля генерального секретаря во многих отношениях определяет жизнь людей. Поэтому и говорят сейчас в СССР: «Куй железо, пока Горбачёв».

Mark: Do you think that it is possible for glasnost to grow into a no-holds-barred type of open discussion and criticism of everything?

Николай: Если бы партия была уверена, что этого никогда не произойдет, у Горбачёва не было бы противников. Ограниченная гласность очень выгодна правящему аппарату, поскольку она возрождает веру населения в социализм. Горбачёв, я думаю, и сам смертельно боится расширения гласности. Его задача закрыть бутылку ещё дого того, как оттуда выскочит джин. Он знает, что потом уже будет поздно. Но он также понимает, что другого выхода нет, и поэтому рискует. Лично я думаю, что он делает это с большим умением.

Mark: It would certainly seem so. It is amazing how far he has come already.

Николай: Он великолепный психолог и тактик. Он знает, что, с одной стороны, люди хотят свободы, но, с другой стороны, в них затаился страх и та особая самоцензура, которая сформирована годами бесправия и насилия и которая не позволяет художнику, артисту, писателю, да и просто мыслящему человеку выйти за пределы гласности. Он внимательно следит за уровнем гласности. По его словам, тот, кто предлагает ценности противоречащие интересам социализма, не может рассчитывать на поддержку правительства. Гласность, с точки зрения Горбачёва, призвана укрепить социализм, а не заменить его другой системой. И это не просто слова.

Mark: I cannot help but think that this is a dangerous game for the party machine to play.

Николай: О, конечно, ты прав. Гласность не только помогает партии укреплять свою власть, она одновременно разрушает эту власть, но, как говорят у нас, «хочешь жить – умей вертеться».

Mark: My sincere wish, of course, is that the people will benefit as much as possible from the changes that are made.

PERESTROIKA

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I am still completely convinced that the goal of perestroika is to preserve the nomenklatura. It is, however, difficult to know how Gorbachev feels about it. He may think in precisely this way, or perhaps he is simply a patriot who is concerned about the difficulties faced by the nation. We cannot even exclude the possibility that deep in his soul he understands that Marxism cannot function as is, that it needs to be restructured and changed. It is also possible that all of these ideas coexist in his consciousness. The main thing is not what he thinks, but what he does. So far, everything that Gorbachev is doing supports my analysis. The ruling class is saving the political system which provides it with a good living. Of course, a certain improvement in the economy may occur, but this economy will not be transferred into the hands of the people without a struggle. This is even more true, of course, of political power.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I agree. This is really quite an obvious difference. This is so, however, only when we discuss the official Soviet press, an official point of view, or an official position. In all other cases we are currently seeing a quite noticeable pluralism which, though less broad in scope than in America, nevertheless exists.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: Some feel, for instance, that perestroika is the improvement of socialism, a necessary step in the development of the country in order to deal with existing difficulties and arrive at a higher level of political and economic development. Others, including myself, feel that perestroika is just another tactical move on the part of the nomenklatura to rekindle dying faith in the political system. A third group sees in perestroika simply a series of measures taken to reestablish, for a time, certain limited elements of private property in order to impove the situation in the country. Still others see it as a means for Gorbachev to consolidate power. Another group feels that it signals the beginning of a turn away from Marxism. It seeks to improve living conditions at the risk of existing political traditions, organizations, and values.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: What sort of influence will they have? Look at how slowly, passively, and suspiciously the population at large reacts to appeals towards perestroika. The population has an excellent memory. It remembers how the peasants were at first given land and then had it taken away, how NEP was introduced and then how all of the "NEP men" were imprisoned, how khozrashchet was discussed under Kruschev and then forgotten. All of this helped to form longstanding mistrust and passivity in the population with regard to political appeals and campaigns. It will take a long time to turn these attributes of the political mentality of the people into its opposite. I have a friend in Tula who is a simple worker. His response to perestroika is, "What's this perestroika to me if I still can't buy meat in the store?"

Mark: .....

Nikolai: Our history, that is, many years of living under dictatorship, has rendered the Soviet people incapable of open expression of feelings and thoughts. On the one hand, they are prone to immediate submission, to an almost automatic fulfillment of all demands of the governing apparatus, to subservient admiration of their leaders. On the other hand, they are prone to mutiny, to a brutal overthrow of all existing foundations of the political structure of the society. This makes the process of perestroika more complex and unpredictable. However, to be fair, it is important to add that at present the first signs of attempts to democratize the society are appearing. I am referring to the creation of clubs and the move towards the creation of a second party.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: In the end, yes.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I think that the word glasnost has two meanings in Russian. In the first place it means that everyone knows everything, that nothing is kept secret. The second meaning implies a certain amount of criticism of the political system.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: I would say that criticism of socialism, the possibility of expressing doubts in the necessity of its existence and usefulness, the denial of the positive role of the CPSU in the development of society, all lie outside the bounds of glasnost. These are the extremes. There are, however, many other things that, despite glasnost, cannot be mentioned today. This is natural, since up to now the Soviet Union does not have a society that is governed by laws worked out by and approved by the people. The will of the general secretary in many ways determines how people live. This is why people now say, in a clever play on words, "Strike while we have Gorbachev." (His name rhymes with "the iron is hot.")

Mark: .....

Nikolai: If the party could be sure that this would never happen, Gorbachev would not have any opponents. Moderate, controlled openness is handy for the ruling apparatus, since it rekindles people's faith in socialism. I think that Gorbachev himself is deathly afraid of the expansion of glasnost. His task is to close the bottle before the genie flies out. He knows that in a while it might be too late. He also realizes, however, that there is no other way out. This is why he is willing to take the risk. I personally think that he is doing this very capably.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: He is an excellent psychologist and tactician. He knows that on the one hand, people want freedom, but that they still are full of fear. They also preserve that self-censorship which came into being during the years of oppression and lack of rights and which keeps the artist, actor, writer, and even simply the thinking person from exceeding the bounds of *glasnost*. He keeps careful watch over the level of *glasnost*. According to his words, he who offers values contradictory to the interests of socialism, can not count upon the support of the government. *Glasnost*, from the point of view of Gorbachev, is called upon to strengthen socialism and not find a substitute for it. These are not just words.

Mark: .....

Nikolai: You are right, of course. *Glasnost* not only helps the party apparatus to strengthen its power, but simultaneously destroys this power. As we say, however, "Life is made up of compromises; you can't always have what you want."

Mark: .....

22.
Послесловие
(Afterword)

The rate and nature of change in a given society is something that I was forced to think about after returning to the USSR in 1987.

Like others interested in the USSR, I had carefully followed Western newspaper and magazine accounts of the remarkable changes occuring in that country.

The changes in publications, particularly Огонёк, Литературная Газета, and Moscow News in Russian were indeed astounding, as was the freeing of certain political prisoners, new rules with regard to placing individuals in mental institutions, repeal of certain privileges for the nomenklatura, an attempt to have two candidates in lower-level elections, phone-in advice services, and the protest demonstrations by various groups. Somehow this led me to believe that I would see changes in many other aspects of life. What amazed me the most was how familiar things looked. Although I saw many, many more people in Western clothing since my first trip in 1970, it surprised me how few other changes I saw, particularly with regard to products and services available to the population at large. Long lines still form at juice and kvass stands, while customers wait for others to finish drinking so that the glasses can be washed and used again due to the lack of paper products. Mustard plasters, which seemed plentiful before and which are a staple of home remedies, were a deficit item in 1987. Although abacuses have disappeared from beriozkas and have been replaced by calculators from Japan, they are still found elsewhere.

An American professor accompanying a group of college students on a study program in the USSR told me that when his students were given carbon copies of materials, they commented that the Xerox machine needed fixing. These American young people in their early twenties didn't recognize a carbon copy (when it wasn't attached to a credit card slip).

That made me stop to think about all of the changes that have affected American consumers in these same last seventeeen years. The following items have all been introduced during this period (to the best of my recollection), yet have so firmly wedged themselves into the lifestyles and thinking of Americans that we cannot imagine life without them. Here is a partial list:

velcro
VCR's
electronic mail
personal computers
Walkmans
pop-up cans
microwave ovens
digital watches
telephone answering machines
universal product codes and the machines which read them
money machines
car telephones
compact discs
call waiting

I have no idea exactly how the introduction of these technological advances have affected the American population, but sooner or later I am sure that sociologists or psychologists will study this phenomenon, just as Sovietologists have already begun to try to evaluate and predict the extent and effect of the political changes that Gorbachev's reforms have introduced.

What I think is indicative of a prevailing mentality, however, is the fact that in capitalistic America the market place changes quickly, often as a result of individual or corporate initiative, while in socialist USSR economic changes have to come from the top and must thus pass through the political sphere.

In thinking about American changes in other areas during the last decade or two, what strikes me as a major change in health habits is that one sees far fewer smokers and that interest in jogging, aerobics, pumping iron, and other forms of exercise has grown exponentially.

In the social/family sphere, the changes that first come to mind include the number of women working, the number of children in day care, the postponing of childbearing, "yuppiedom," greater involvement of men in household and child-rearing tasks, and reappraisal of the "new morality" in view of the AIDS epidemic. In the political sphere the new conservatism is striking. This is the very beginning of a list of changes that have occurred all around us. Sometimes we find it easier to study another society's changes than to take a careful look at our own.

For this reason, I would like to close my diary of differences between American and Soviet societies by asking the readers to compare changes that have occurred most recently in both societies in the field that interests them the most.

ENDNOTES

1. Kay Chorao, *Molly's Moe* (New York: Seabury Press, 1976).
2. A. I. Solzhenitsyn, *Gulag Archipelago* Vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 223.
3. Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, *"Bratskaya GES" (The Bratsk Hydroelectric Power Station)*, *Yunost'* (April 1965), p. 56.
4. There is an extensive literature demonstrating that the state-party apparatus in the USSR is a class. See, for example: Lin Yutang, *The Secret Name* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, 1958); Milovan Djilas, *The New Class* (New York: Praeger, 1958); Hedrick Smith, *The Russians* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1977); Mikhael Voznesenskiy, *Nomenklatura*: Pravyashchiy Klass SSSR (*Nomenclature: The Ruling Class in the USSR*) (Vienna-Munich: Fritz Malden Verlag, 1980).
5. Joseph Stalin, *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1939).
6. Roy A. Medvedev, *Let History Judge* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), p. 538.